

No. 4265.128



250

Family of

William Lloyd Garrison

X 01/0 1878

Boston Public Library

Do not write in this book or mark it with pen or pencil. Penalties for so doing are imposed by the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This book was issued to the borrower on the date last stamped below.

FEB -8 1949

SECOND EDITION.

Price 20 Cents.

BORDER METHODISM

AND

4265,128

BORDER SLAVERY.

BY

Rev. J. MAYLAND M'CARTER,

Of the Philadelphia Annual Conference.

BORDER METHODISM

AND

BORDER SLAVERY.

BEING

A STATEMENT AND REVIEW OF THE ACTION OF THE
PHILADELPHIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE
CONCERNING SLAVERY,

AT ITS LATE

4265.128

SESSION AT EASTON, Pa.

INCLUDING

THE CASE OF REV. J. D. LONG: THE SLAVEHOLDING AMONG MEMBERS OF THE BODY:
THE EXTENT AND CHARACTER OF SLAVEHOLDING IN OUR TERRITORY:
AND "THE CRUSHING OUT" OF REV. J. S. LAME SINCE
THE LATE SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE.

BY

REV. J. MAYLAND M'CARTER,
OF THE PHILADELPHIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

PHILADELPHIA:

COLLINS, PRINTER, 705 LODGE ALLEY.

FOR SALE BY
HIGGINS & PERKINS, 36 NORTH FOURTH ST.

1858.

Family of
William Lloyd Garrison

July 8, 1899.

THE writer of this pamphlet took very full notes of the proceedings of the Conference at its late session. He has had considerable experience in reporting Educational and Ecclesiastical Conventions, and he was responsible for the reports of the Conference which appeared in one of the leading dailies of Philadelphia. Those reports were corrected by his notes. Many of the remarks are in the very words of the speaker, and the writer has exercised his greatest care in preparing a correct statement of all matters of action and the remarks thereon.

Should any one object to the correctness of the report of the action had as here given, he will be the first who will have intimated to us, in our experience in reporting, a material omission, or an erroneous statement.

Note to Second Edition.

Dr. I. T. Cooper has attacked this pamphlet in the New York "Christian Advocate and Journal." Three letters against it have appeared in that paper. Those letters we regard as confirmatory only of our fidelity.

A WORD TO THE READER.

WE regard the Border as now the great battle-ground of the church. Recent and numerous facts show that the sentiment of the membership, in this portion of our territory, on the question of slavery lags far behind that which is general in the church. This sentiment on the Border is sought to be inflamed into antagonism to what we are safe in regarding as the controlling conviction of the Methodist Episcopal Church. To-day the great maternal heart of our church beats with the pulses of freedom as it has never beat since 1810. Already, because of this, the precursors of schism, if not of separation, in appalling frequency flit by us who are on the Border, announcing that the speedy hereafter will bring recreancy to our principles and our past, or fidelity to them at the expense of agitation such as has never yet rolled its thunders through our sky. On the one hand there is demanded concession to slavery in the church; on the other, a better legislation, for the purpose of bringing up our administration to our anti-slavery professions. With many, the latter is denied as being needed, because of the actual relations of the church to slavery. On this point light is sought to be thrown by this publication.

Eighteen years of itinerant labor in the Philadelphia Conference, expended on each of the districts within our geographical limits, seven of which were spent in slaveholding portions of our territory, together with as careful observation as we were capable of bestowing, have given us impressions such as we would humbly contribute to the joint stock of suggestion and fact which create the popular opinion of the church.

Between the representations made at the last General Conference in regard to the church's administration of her Discipline on the question of slavery, and the convictions of the writer, there is, he confesses, the widest possible variance. That our laws are faithfully administered on this subject, and that little or no mercenary slaveholding obtains in our church, we are very far from regarding as correct statements of fact. In relation to the Philadelphia Conference especially, we speak with the certainty which local knowledge of facts is always supposed to give. With regard also to the number of slaveholders in the church, as announced at the last session of the General Conference, and given upon the authority of an honored name in the church, it will be seen we have arrived at a greatly larger estimate even for our Conference.

The author's anti-slavery creed is comprised in the old Methodist word "*Extirpation.*" We have deferred, as will be seen, to men, measures, and opinions, only as they are allies, not enemies, of this great principle. The man standing between the object sought to be extirpated, and any force which honestly seeks to lend itself to the side of freedom, must not complain if his true character and position, as we see it, are pointed out; for a few stray arrows are spared from the quiver which was filled originally but for use against the force beyond and behind him. These are used, not for the pleasure of harassing the "daysman" which seeks to mediate between slavery and its opponents; but for the purpose of getting him out of his position as an ally of oppression rather than as a friend of freedom.

There may arise occasions when the mandate of the Almighty shall be as clearly indicated by facts about us, as was that which bared the sword and put it into the hand of the man "on the Lord's side," to be used against those who, from kindred and associations, are dearest. It may be used with reluctance, and we may weep tears over the exigence; but the stern conviction of duty to God, to the oppressed, and to his church, requires its performance.

We are reminded, by the manner in which the defenders of slavery in the church act, in their set speeches, their writings, and

other defences of this "church institution," as some regard it, of the old military stratagem of protecting the front from attack by putting forward the persons of those who are accounted sacred. The person who desires to detach slavery from the church, is reduced to the alternative of either permitting a minority to have everything their own way in the controversy, or of incurring the imputation of fanaticism, perhaps of malignity and impiety, for an honest onset against slavery and its abettors in the church. Now the controlling sentiment amongst us is, as we have said, that slavery is doomed, in our church, and that the demon which has found a sanctuary at God's altar shall no longer be shielded by its pretended sanctity, nor protected by persons or names, however high or sacred; but that the strong moral conviction of the Methodist people shall excommunicate and anathematize this "infernal spirit of slavery,"* *whose greatest hold on life in this nation, is found in the religious alliances it has been permitted to contract.*

We are aware that the charge of hostility to the church will meet us upon the publication of this pamphlet, and perhaps no pains will be spared to lessen our claim to a hearing by imputations upon character and motives. We shall be disappointed if it is not so. But we have only this to say: Our love for the church has prompted this review of our Conference action. We love it too well to see it dishonored, and remain silent! No hearing could be had for the side of the question which a few of us represented at the Conference, and misrepresentations of "certain brethren" have been circulated. Hence, our love for our brethren, for the church, and for the cause of anti-slavery, has prompted what we have written.

All our interests for this life, all our hopes for the life to come, are bound up in the Church of God. The memory of a father who died long years ago in the bosom of the Methodist Episcopal Church—of a sister who more recently passed from its membership on earth—and of three of our little ones "which sleep," who were baptized at her altars; and the love of the living—of her who, reared on slave

* Asbury.

soil, became there the wife of an itinerant preacher, and the mother of his children—of an aged mother, who is finding support in the ministrations of God's servants in our sanctuaries; together with twenty-two years of association, since as a child the church received us into her fold—eighteen of which have been gladly given, as boy and man, to her itinerancy;—all these bespeak attachments such as would make us prefer any calamity to ourselves, rather than perform an act of hostility to this church. No! By the memory of the dead—by the love of the living—by our interest in the church's success—by our convictions of duty—and by our hopes of the Great Hereafter; by each, by all of these, are we compelled to work with those who seek the immediate extirpation of slavery from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

READING, PA.: May 27, 1858.

PHILADELPHIA CONFERENCE AND SLAVERY.

CHAPTER I.

Slaveholding territory in Philadelphia Annual Conference—The slave trade, and Conference silence in relation to it—Church relations to slavery—Pastoral address of 1847—Silence broken by prosecution of Rev. J. D. Long.

A CHURCH, planted in the midst of any community whatsoever, is required, from the very object of its formation, to bear consistent, steady, and unequivocal testimony against every institution which affects directly or indirectly the moral and religious welfare of all who constitute that community. This is a part of the church's mission to the world. A church possessing power in the midst of slavery cannot but owe an important duty to society there. Its primary work as a church may not consist in distributing Bibles and missionaries in heathen lands, but in the diffusion of a definite moral influence in respect to a present and existing evil institution.

It is thus that we suggest the ground of obligation on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church to act in regard to slavery in her slave territory. Thus, too, we arrive at the idea of obligation on the part of a conference of ministers, and the members composing it, to create and maintain unceasing hostility to slavery and the slave trade, situated as is the Philadelphia Conference.

True Christianity is recognized by its influence in moulding the institutions of a community in which it is found; while, on the contrary, a *false* or *defective* Christianity seems to be moulded by the institutions of a community. The latter can go to China, and by its priests disciple whole millions who are not a whit the more Christians for the chrism and the mummery of their teachers. It can go to South America, and drive thousands of the aborigines to the embrace of its sacraments, and yet leave them savages. It can do more :

it can thunder in our own Conference against abolitionism, and be quiet as to the system of slavery and the practice of slave-keeping. We do not now speak of that apostate sentiment in the churches which, in the farther South, has issued a bull teaching, if we may borrow an illustration, the "*immaculate conception of slavery*," and requiring the faithful to receive it as a new dogma of their creed, but of the teaching heard among us that "simple" villany, or slave-holding, is a matter constitutionally provided for in the church, and that war upon it must necessarily, therefore, be war upon the church.

The territory of the Conference embraces portions of the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, and the whole of the State of Delaware.

The *slave-holding* territory of the Conference consists of Delaware, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and the Eastern Shore of Virginia. Delaware is only nominally a slave State, two out of the three counties having not more than four hundred slaves, and the third, Sussex, having nearly all the slaves that are found in the State, but amounting to less, in that county, than two thousand. The law passed in 1827, by which the importation and exportation of slaves were prohibited, under severe penalties, has had the effect of causing a steady diminution of their numbers; thus confirming the statement of Henry Clay, that slaves "were only profitable in farming districts, in agricultural communities, because of the high prices obtained for them, and that this only kept it alive in such communities."

Maryland and Virginia are slave-breeding States. From a pamphlet lying before us, entitled "Report of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives of South Carolina on so much of Gov. Adams's Message as relates to Slavery and the Slave Trade," 1857, and which is testimony from a quarter not infected with abolitionism, we learn that, "calculating the increase of slaves in ten years at 30 per cent., for the ten years ending with 1850, Maryland kept at home, of that increase, 631 slaves, and exported to other States 26,279. Virginia kept at home 23,441 slaves, and exported 111,259." As this report was gotten up for the purpose of showing that the supply from slave-breeding States was not equal to the demand, and that therefore the re-opening of the foreign slave trade was a necessity, the probability is that the error, if any, is on the other side from that for which we have used the statement of the "Report." The tabular view, given in the same report, further shows that, tak-

ing the former method of calculation, there were kept at home, in the five slave-breeding States, 154,000 of their natural increase, and 235,000 exported.

Of this whole number, Maryland and Virginia exported 138,000—very considerably more than the half; more nearly two-thirds of the whole.

We might pause at these figures and ask what had the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Baltimore and Philadelphia Annual Conferences done directly, during the same number of years, as to conferences and ministers, toward putting down a trade in those two States whose territory, in great part, is shared by them? Can they show a single protest in any resolution in either of these bodies, during the last ten years, against this traffic, not to speak of the system that feeds it? If anything has been done at all, it has been done to conciliate slave-holders, to denounce anti-slavery agitation and action; and if any one expression has been used, recognizing slavery as an evil, other expressions, it is believed, were used in connection therewith eminently gratifying to slave-dealers and slave-holders.

The Philadelphia Conference has but two counties of Virginia, but it meets the slave trade in those counties, and these are about as great exporters of slaves as any others in the State, in proportion to the population. In almost every town on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, professional slave-traders are located, and where none such are found in the villages and neighborhoods, they have their agents, through whom they are informed of slaves which are in the market.

What had the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Philadelphia Conference, with a large membership spreading over the same territory as that traversed by these slave-dealers, been doing in her quarterly conferences, in her class meetings, in her love feasts, at her camp meetings, in her pulpits? What had the church been doing amidst almost daily scenes, surpassing in horror, in some of its features, the terrible outrages of the same trade in human beings on the African coast? Did the church obey God's voice, and, as a church, actively oppose this evil?

The writer knows that the Methodist Episcopal Church is a power in every department of political and social interest on the slaveholding soil of the Conference. Her membership is almost three times larger than all other churches combined on that portion of our work. Those members are composed in great part of the persons



making and administering the laws of those communities. She holds a controlling, if not a directing, power in regard to the religious and social sentiment of the people in those communities.

And what did the Conference itself, in its annual gatherings, to inspire right sentiments, or teach right views in regard to these horrible and atheistic practices? Did it, even in twenty years, bear its testimony on the subject of the internal slave trade so rife in its borders? Might it not infer responsibility for evils and abuses the most dreadful ever performed in any Christian community? Ought it to have been silent on slavery, and its kindred abominations of this character, so long? Should it not have inferred some responsibility in the matter from the fact and amount of power lodged in its hands? Other bodies of ministers, in other churches and States, have done so, and very properly, we think. Read the following, and remember the description is equally applicable to much of our field of ministerial labor.


“Brutal stripes, and all the various kinds of personal indignities, are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses. The law does not recognize the family relations of a slave, and extends to him no protection in the enjoyment of domestic endearments. The members of a slave family may be forcibly separated, so that they shall never more meet till the final judgment; and cupidity often induces the masters to practise what the law allows. Brothers and sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives, are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us. The shrieks and the agony often witnessed on such occasions proclaim, with a trumpet tongue, the INIQUITY AND CRUELTY OF THIS SYSTEM.”—*Synod of Kentucky. Address.*


To show the unblushing cruelties of this trade would be a task beyond any pen, and would defy exaggeration. The county papers are full of advertisements of “negro buyers,” and the notices of sales of “valuable negroes.” As a specimen we have lying before us the “Cambridge [Md.] Democrat” of the 20th of Jan., 1858, which contains the Inaugural of Gov. Hicks and these matters. They are the best answer to his flings at morbid philanthropists. In this single issue there appear the following, which, as is seen from their dates, are fresh advertisements for this issue:—

CASH FOR NEGROES.

We are at all times purchasing SLAVES, paying the highest cash prices. Persons wishing to sell will call at No. 11 CAMDEN Str., Baltimore. Negroes received to BOARD. Communications addressed to  WILSON & HINDES.  Any communications left with WM. H. GRACE, Esq., in Cambridge, will be attended to. [Jan. 20, 1858—1y.]

NEGROES WANTED.


 I am again in the market, and will pay liberal prices in CASH for likely NEGROES who are slaves for life.

Persons having such property for sale, will do well to see me  before they sell, as I will be at all times prepared to purchase. Communications addressed to me at Easton, or information left with SAMUEL R. VINTON, in Cambridge, will be promptly attended to.

WM. HARKER.

Jan. 20, 1858-3m*

VALUABLE NEGROES AT PUBLIC SALE.

 By virtue of an order of the Orphans' Court of Dorchester County I will, as acting Administrator of F. B. C. Turpin, expose at public sale, at the store of Henry Lord, AT CROTCHER'S FERRY,

ON SATURDAY, FEB. 13TH, 1858.


the following NEGROES, slaves for life: Negro woman MARIA, aged 65 years; negro woman MILLY, aged 20 years, and infant child about 2 months old.

The above negroes will be sold, in or out of the State, on a credit of six months, to the highest bidder.

LOWDER SIRMAN,
Acting Administrator.

Jan. 20, 1858-3t

POSTPONED SALE.

 I will sell at PUBLIC SALE at the Court House door, in Cambridge, ON MONDAY NEXT, 25th INST, negro girl GEORGIANA, aged 16 years, slave for life.

Terms cash, or note with good security, payable in six months.

W. R. PATTISON,

Jan. 20, 1858.

This in a professedly Christian State and the 19th century! In his Commentary upon Isaiah xxxviii. 6, Dr. Adam Clarke says:—

“How can any State pretend to fast or worship God at all, or dare profess that they believe in the existence of such a Being, while they carry on what is called the slave-trade, and traffic in the souls and blood and bodies of men! O, ye most flagitious of knaves and worst of hypocrites! cast off at once the mask of religion, and deepen not your endless perdition by professing the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ while ye continue in this traffic!”

The advertisements here given, however, are not by members or preachers in the M. E. Church: those will be found in a subsequent part of the pamphlet, and are not, in *humanity*, a whit above those here given.

But this silence in the Conference was destined to be broken—not upon the part of any ministers of the body by seeking to obtain the outspoken testimony of the Conference against these cruelties; or against slavery as a system; or against slaveholding in

the church which found so many of those men ministering at altars set up amidst these abominations; but by the contemplated prosecution of one of their own members for the rash act of publishing a book against the whole business, and the evil principle out of which these practices are found to shoot as naturally as on the old sedge fields of Maryland and Virginia the pine-tree springs from the cone and seed which are scattered by the winds from the parent tree over the surrounding acres; or which are planted by the thriftless owner for the double purpose of obtaining posts and rails and of enriching the soil which is protected by their speedy growth and derives nutriment and value from the decayed *shatters* which they shed.

For eleven years the Philadelphia Annual Conference had given no formal attention by resolution or speeches to the subject of slavery. The last Committee on Slavery which had been appointed was that of 1846, whose action is found reported in the Pastoral Address of 1847, at the Wilmington Conference, and by the committee appointed to prepare that address, incorporated as a part of the address itself. Since about the year 1820, it is believed that the anti-slavery sentiment of the body has been declining rapidly, and all her action upon the subject has been more and more conciliatory toward slavery.

We have been in attendance upon eighteen annual sessions of the Conference, and have heard again and again the question, "Are you an abolitionist?" put to candidates for admission to probation in the body, as well as to candidates for membership, after two years as travelling preachers under its direction. During the last few years the question has grown into disuse. The last time we heard it asked was at the Smyrna Conference in the spring of 1852, and then in reference to a brother who was received upon credentials from the Wesleyan body in Ireland. Our itinerant life began in 1840, when in our sixteenth year; and, after two years' service under the presiding elder, we were admitted on probation in the body.

In looking over all those years in the Conference, we can recollect no period in which the claims of the slave, at any meeting of the Conference, or in any quarterly or leaders' meeting, or in any preacher's District Association, have had a hearing. The claims of slaveholders have been canvassed and conceded to their hearts' content. Every office, from leader up to lay Conference Steward, has found slaveholders in its occupancy. Our pulpits have been,

in not a few instances, filled with slaveholders. The Conference in its action has borne no testimony against the practice of holding slaves, while it has refused admission to the abolitionist. While occupying as part of its work portions of two of the most noted slave-breeding States in the Union, it has lifted up no voice in its collective gatherings of ministers against the wrongs and outrages of the trade in the souls and bodies of human beings exported annually from those States to the rice swamp and the cotton-fields of the far South.

Not a road over which the members of the Philadelphia Annual Conference have passed, in Maryland and Virginia, but has been travelled by the manacled slave torn from the endearments of birth-place and kindred. Scarcely an altar of any church in which he has ministered from which the slave has not been taken to return no more to that place in the church's gallery, where he was wont to worship and sing of heaven as the place where "the slave should be free from his master." And in many instances the church's own dark children have been the victims of these cruel exportations.

They have gone! but not by the tide of voluntary emigration, or by death, from our churches. Their names have been lost to the class record, but they bore not with them a certificate of membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church to their distant bondage. Why should they? It would but enhance their market value, and put the more dollars into the pockets of the mercenary wretches, who would sell the religion of the slave by making the evidence of its possession the reason for a higher bid as he stood on the auction block.

These Methodists were taken, but no minister among us, perhaps, offered prayer in the sanctuary that Heaven might watch over those lambs of the flock torn away from his watch care. And against that legalized system of plundering his fold or his flock there was no voice of remonstrance lifted up, no proclamation of wrath against the robber. Had he been put in charge of senseless beasts by another, and had one but violently been wrested from his care, he would have told his employer of the ruthless violence which had taken it away. But put in charge of souls for which the Redeemer died, who laid down his life for those sheep, we could give them up as the prey of the spoiler without remonstrance and without protest by the Conference against the system and relation of which this was one of the fruits.

Each year in the slave population of Maryland and Virginia a large portion of the "increase" is carried away into the more southern States. During the eleven years of Conference silence, how many thousands have been borne away in chains from the fields of labor occupied by the ministers of the Philadelphia Conference. Methodists, too, have helped to swell the number of those thus sold, and yet the Conference has been silent. Ah! in the church's own bosom is the foul plague spot and her relation to slavery, in the connection of preachers, stewards, leaders, and private members with slaveholding—in this there is found the secret of silence to the enormities of the traffic in the world without; because the principle of *property in human beings* is conceded practically in the church, and she can but be a very "Satan reproving sin" by condemning the laws and usages which control movable property in its being carried to the highest market.

How great a contrast such indifference presents to the conduct of more early Christians, in like circumstances, may be seen in the following:—

"Both religion and humanity make it a duty for us to work for the deliverance of the captive. They are sanctuaries of Jesus Christ, who have fallen into the hands of the infidel. It is Jesus Christ himself whom we ought to consider in our captive brothers; it is Him whom we should deliver from captivity—Him who has delivered us from death. We must redeem with a little money Him who has redeemed us with all his blood. Can we, no matter how little humanity we possess, believe that these captives are strangers to any one of us, who altogether form but one family!"—*St. Cyprian to the Bishops of Numidia.*

"A number of Christians being taken into captivity, eight bishops wrote to St. Cyprian, imploring his assistance for their redemption. He shed many tears on reading these letters, and, at his recommendation, the clergy and people of Carthage raised a sum amounting to about £781 English—for the redemption of the slaves."—*St. Cyprian.*

We learn from the life of St. Augustine, that he sometimes melted down the sacred vessels of the church to redeem captives, in which he was authorized by the example of St. Ambrose.

But the contrast and the apostasy from the religion of the Merciful Redeemer, is seen in the fact that Methodists not unfrequently sell their slaves into interminable captivity to slave traders.

Is not this fact significant? Does not this silence prove more than volumes of sentimental twaddle as to the amount of interest which, in our Conference, is felt for the slave, and the strength of our professed anti-slaveryism? Year after year we appointed committees on Education and Temperance. We could muster eloquence and

votes, and triumphantly pledge the Conference and its members, to use all their influence to obtain the breaking up of the license systems of the States in which we labored, and individually to co-operate in regard to the political question of a prohibitory law, but could not feel ourselves called to do what Patrick Henry said even laymen, not ministers, should regard as duty in reference to the laws, making, holding, breeding, and selling human beings. "It is a *duty*," said he, "which we owe to the purity of our religion to show that it is at war with that *law* which warrants slavery." It cannot fail to strike one as strange, that eleven years should have passed away, and during all that time our Conference should have done nothing, as a Conference, against slavery.

Its explanation may, perhaps, be found in the paper we now submit to you. It is the last public action which the Conference had, the object of which was to quiet the slaveholding Methodists of Accomack and Northampton Counties, Virginia, after the division of the church. Though this be its history, its sentiments on slavery, as expressed and inferred, are indicative of our status *then*, on the subject. The present pamphlet may show what it is now.

PASTORAL ADDRESS

Of the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to the Societies under its care, within the bounds of the Northampton and Accomack Circuits, dated April 7th, 1847.

DEAR BRETHREN—That glorious work of religion which for nearly a hundred years has pervaded our country, by means of the Methodist ministry and economy, has nowhere been more signal than upon the peninsula, of which your territory is a part. It was here that the venerable Asbury frequently ministered, and from the homes of your fathers he sent his letters to Mr. Wesley, informing him of the wonderful work of God in America. Indeed, he was accustomed to speak of the peninsula as the garden spot of Methodism. We, too, have been accustomed to hear our fathers speak of it in the same terms, insomuch that your "praise is in all the churches."

It is, therefore, with unfeigned regret we have learned that events have occurred, which threaten to alienate from this Conference the confidence and kind feelings of a portion, at least, of your community. Whatever may be the feelings of those whose expressions toward us may appear to be inconsiderate, we must be permitted to avow that we are greatly pained at the thought of losing their confidence and affection. We cannot forget their kindness to us as a body of ministers, for more than threescore years; and shall ever retain a lively remembrance of the spiritual communion we have so often had with them, which we regarded as a manifestation of the grace which we preached among them, and the love they bore toward us. We hold you, brethren, as a part of the flock of Christ, which we have received as a precious legacy

from our fathers; and God is our record how greatly we long for you all in the bowels of Jesus.

In addressing you as your pastors, we would at all times use words of truth and soberness; and more especially would we, on this occasion, speak to you in the fear of God. We feel persuaded that the unhappy excitement, and its disastrous consequences, which have been manifested within your bounds, are owing to a misapprehension of the views and feelings of this Conference. It is of these we would speak to you in this address, and not of those particular transactions among you which have disturbed your peace, and embarrassed the free publication of the word of God among you by us as heretofore.

It is well known to you that at the late General Conference a violent rupture of our church was apprehended. The spirit of peace and charity suggested the provision of a plan which should lessen the evils of division, if division, as was apprehended, should become inevitable. It is not our purpose to inquire whether a division of the church was necessary. The division has taken place; and it is material to observe that each portion of the church has claimed to regulate its administration by the plan provided to meet the exigency.

Finding that some portions of the church, South, had suggested, and it was said had, in some cases, acted on the suggestion that a border Conference, not voting to adhere to either side, was not under the protection of the plan in respect to restraining pastoral jurisdiction from the adjacent Conference; and that ours was regarded by them as a border Conference; in order to cut off all occasion, and thereby to insure peace in the church and community, we voted to adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, notwithstanding we are of opinion that we are not a border Conference, within the meaning of the "plan," as the Baltimore Conference and Chesapeake Bay intervene between us and the Virginia Conference. With this opinion agrees the decision of all our bishops, as expressed in their resolution, passed in Philadelphia, March 4th last, and published in the *Christian Advocate* and *Journal* of the 24th of the same month, in these words:—

"Whereas, the Discipline says, 'Virginia Conference shall be bounded on the east by the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean;' and 'Philadelphia Conference shall include the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia—the Chesapeake Bay, an arm of the ocean, being between them;' therefore *Resolved*, That in our administration we will regard the 'Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia' as not being 'border' work, in the sense of the 'plan of separation.'"

We cannot, therefore, but regard all the Methodist societies within the peninsula as under our pastoral jurisdiction, according to the provisions of the "plan of separation;" and we have good hope that there will be an agreement with us in this opinion, when the matter is carefully and dispassionately considered.

If the "plan of separation" gives us the pastoral care of you, it remains to inquire whether we have done anything as a Conference, or as men, to forfeit your confidence and affection. We are not advised that even in the great excitement which has distressed you for some months past, any one has impeached our moral conduct, or charged us with unsoundness in doctrine, or corruption, or tyranny in the administration of discipline. But we learn that the simple cause of the unhappy excitement among you is, that some suspect us, or affect to suspect us, of being abolitionists. Yet no particular

act of the Conference, or any particular member thereof, is adduced as the ground of the erroneous and injurious suspicion. We would ask you, brethren, whether the conduct of our ministry among you for sixty years ought not to be sufficient to protect us from this charge—whether the question we have been accustomed, for a few years past, to put to candidates for admission among us, namely: *Are you an abolitionist?* and without each one answered in the negative he was not received, ought not to protect us from the charge—whether the action of the last Conference on this particular matter ought not to satisfy any fair and candid mind that we are not, and do not desire to be, abolitionists? The views and purposes of the last Conference to which we refer were expressed in the words below, which we must believe have not been generally read in your community, or the apprehensions which have been so earnestly expressed would never have been entertained. The words of the Conference are:—

The committee to whom was referred a certain preamble and resolution on the subject of slavery and abolition recommend the following report:—

That we, the members of the Philadelphia Annual Conference, are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery; but at the same time we know our calling too well to interfere with matters not properly belonging to the Christian ministry. We stand, in relation to slavery and abolition, where we have always stood, and where we expect to stand, “walking by the same rule, and minding the same things;” and ask that our action in the past may be taken as an index to our action in the future; therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That we will abide by the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church as it is; and will resist every attempt to alter it in reference to slavery so as to change the terms of membership.

2. *Resolved*, That we sincerely deprecate all agitation of the exciting subjects which have unhappily divided the church; and, impressed with the vital importance, especially for these times, of the apostolic injunction, “Be at peace among yourselves,” we will, as far as lies in our power, follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.”

Upon presenting this paper to you, in which we say, “We stand in relation to slavery and abolition where we have always stood,” it is proper that we should remind you of the fact, that the provisions in the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with respect to slavery, are precisely the same, even to the very words. We cannot, therefore, see how we can be regarded as abolitionists, without the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, being considered in the same light. We must indulge the hope that, when the facts and reasonings contained in this address come to be known to you, and to those among whom you live, reflection and truth will regain their wonted ascendancy, and peace and confidence return to your afflicted community. We would also say, that there are members of this Conference who have, from time to time, given you the most conclusive evidence, by their public acts and writings, that they are far from being abolitionists, and who with confidence and love abide in the Conference of their early choice.

In conclusion, brethren, allow us to assure you of our kindest regards, our tenderest sympathy, and our earnest and continued prayers for you; and to exhort you to use forbearance and prudence in your severe trials. We have confidence that you will stand fast and prove yourself worthy in these your afflictions. We trust, in a short time, you will have the presence and spiritual comfort and support of ministers such as you have been accustomed to

esteem and reverence. And being fully apprised of your difficulties, and carefully advised and admonished of their delicate and arduous duties, we doubt not but that they will satisfy you, by their conduct, of our kind and upright intentions herein set forth to you.

Wishing you all heavenly benedictions, we are, dear brethren, yours in Christ Jesus.

J. P. DURBIN,	} Committee.
J. KENNADAY,	
IGNATIUS T. COOPER,	
WILLIAM H. GILDER,	
JOSEPH CASTLE,	

Wilmington, Del., April 7, 1847.

This Pastoral Address has been recently published in tract form, by Rev. J. D. Long, in consequence of his being charged with giving garbled extracts from it in his book. How much the whole mends the parts may be seen. Here is Mr. Long's note, which is appended to the Address:—

In my book, "Pictures of Slavery," page 41, I gave an extract from the Pastoral Address of the Philadelphia Annual Conference for 1847, signed by Dr. Durbin, Dr. Kennaday, Dr. I. T. Cooper, Dr. Castle and W. H. Gilder. I said of this address that it was unequivocally a pro-slavery document, and takes the same pro-slavery ground as the M. E. Church, South. Dr. Durbin and others of the Committee think that I have given a wrong interpretation to their language, and also that I have not done them justice by taking a mere extract from their report. This has induced me to give the original report, as found in the "History of the Great Secession," by Dr. Elliott, page 1083, Document 72. Dr. Elliott's book was written by order of the General Conference. Now of the original document I say that it falsifies the historical past of our Conference, cringes to the slaveholders of Maryland and Virginia, assumes the same position as the Church South towards slaveholders among the laity, and pledges the Conference in the future against all attempts to alter the Discipline so as to expel slaveholders from the church. In recent conversations with Dr. Durbin and others, we have not heard the least intimation of regret for any sentiment expressed in the report.

J. D. LONG.

Of the abolitionism which could keep a young minister of Jesus out of the Conference, though he had every other qualification, Dr. Elliott justly says "it was abolitionism *in the Methodist Episcopal Church*, and not in *politics*."—*Great Secession*, p. 514.

Besides the annotations of Brother Long, you will observe that this silence of the Conference, of the pulpit, and of the church upon slavery, is the *recognized duty of Methodist preachers as therein taught*. Not only is no shame felt for this non-interference of Gospel teaching and Conference non-intervention, but it is gloried in, for "we know our calling too well to interfere with matters not properly belonging to the Christian ministry." Our faith runs not

thus. Founders of churches, and conferences of ministers were never called upon to solve the problem as to how a moral evil could be regulated by making it respectable. To do this would be to attempt to obliterate by the ministers of Jesus all the distinctions by Him asserted as to good and evil.

"The axe is to be laid unto the root of the tree," and this does not mean to wait until the tree dies before used. In this sense it has been lying at the root of the tree of Slavery too long; we have picked it up and have commenced chopping, and any sprouts which interfere with our elbow-room for the axe, we have been compelled to hack at a little, and those which are so close to the tree as to be identified, we feel it a duty to use the axe upon, or let the tree alone. Such is our apology for some things done in our pamphlet.

We cannot Christianize the spirit or practice of slavery. We have too long tried to conciliate it by prudent measures, and to tolerate it to gain advancement for ecclesiastical institutions. We are hastening as men and as ministers to God's last judgment, where I believe silence on great moral questions will be treated as crime.

If such a hideous monster as slavery was a thing capable of being vilified, or worthy of being conciliated, what is it this side the infernal pit, that we can, as Christians and as ministers, make relentless war upon! In the language of Asbury: "If Christianity will *tolerate* slavery, what will it not authorize?"

Pulpit silence is one of the strange suggestions intimated by the paper. The pulpit as an institution of Christianity, ranks highest among the effective instrumentalities seeking the world's evangelization. Strange, that after so many centuries of existence, each one of which has given attestation of its power, that its legitimate functions should be made the subject of inquiry, and that its prerogatives should seem to need definition. Yet such, we are convinced, is the case in America, at the time of this present writing. Regarded everywhere among Christians, as the representative of the Christian teaching of the church, in a form recognized authoritatively by the church's Great Head, its responsibilities to Him, and to the race, are among the matters of highest spiritual moment.

But those responsibilities are, to a great extent, to be determined by a knowledge of its legitimate sphere. The inquiry as to what is the sphere of the pulpit—what are its duties, and what its limitations, are not unimportant considerations to the church of God, and more especially to those set apart to the work of the holy ministry.

We concede that the pulpit is not the place for the discussion of opinions of any political party, as such—where the defence of political and partisan notions should be heard merely as having claim from party or politics to consideration; but the moral tendencies of any set of political opinions belonging to any party just in so far as they either directly or indirectly lead to the violation of Divine law—to the support of any iniquity, whether it take the form of oppression or of gambling, ought to be made the subject of pulpit attention.

The pulpit should discuss every hindrance to popular or individual virtue, lay open the iniquity of every creed or measure which is in conflict with the interests of religion, or an obstacle to the salvation of souls.

As a primal acceptance, then, in the catalogue of virtues in possession of the occupant of the pulpit, there must be *consecration such as sinks the individual, and exalts conviction*. Here is the test of ministerial manhood. In this you discover the only principle out of which God himself can make preachers for the times, or indeed for any time. Wesley and Luther were not less the exponents of this truth in their human history, than of the doctrine whose teaching wrought out the eras in religion conjoined with their names. “We believe, and therefore *speak* ;” we must see, was equally their avowal, as that of Christ’s Apostles. But the concession implied in silence, in reference to great moral delinquencies in church or state, should make one skeptical in regard to the premise of the inspired declaration, were its conclusion other than utterance. The belief and the speech in all men professing to be teachers sent of God, will be the simple relation of cause and effect, unless recreancy to moral conviction obtains; the guilt of which brands the conscience with the crime of Judas, and in Heaven’s last judgment will thus brand the character.

And just here, too, we may easily distinguish the character of the pretender to the office of Christian teacher, from that of the genuine! The former is ever asking at every turn, What is right *for me*? The latter merely, What is right? It is the individual in the one case preferred to the Infinite! In the other, the Infinite, with the individual sunk out of sight. The former may not be willing to support wrong actively, but is the very man who above all others is not to be trusted in the support of right. In the conflict he may be

hero enough to go into the fight, but only stay there so long as the spear of the Carthaginian is kept away from his face. To spoil their beauty, and thus their fortune, the sons of Rome's patricians could not consent a second time to run the hazard of a charge, and deaf to the rallying cry, even though the cause of their country hung on their decision of obedience, they determine the question each, What is right *for me*? their decision is seen written on their coward backs as they flee the field, and desert their compatriots in arms.

We have shown the slave-trade in our territory, and our silence; let us look now at the relation of the Methodist Episcopal Church itself to slavery within the bounds of the Philadelphia Conference. This is seen by the following considerations:—

Many of our private members are slaveholders. We do not say that these are numerous when compared with the thousands of members in Maryland, and Virginia, and Sussex County, Delaware. We have given some attention to the question, and from our observation on the two districts, Easton and Snow Hill, we have come to the conclusion that there are about fifteen hundred members of our church in the Philadelphia Annual Conference who are slaveholders. We give five hundred to Easton and one thousand to Snow Hill District. These, we think, are owners of about 4,000 slaves. This is not too large an estimate. It has been made up and the figures obtained from those ministers who have spent a large part of the last ten years on those districts. My own observation would lead me to regard the number above given as probably correct.

Many of the stewards are slaveholders. To a great extent this office is represented by the moneyed men in the church—the large holders of property. One-half of the whole number of stewards on those districts are probably slaveholders. While on the upper portions of Maryland, and in Delaware, they are comparatively but as one in five, on the southern portions of both districts the precise reverse may be taken as the ratio.

One-half of the trustees of churches are probably connected with slavery.

Exhorters, leaders, and local preachers are slaveholders. The proportion of slaveholders to the entire membership (white) on Snow Hill District is about one to every ten; on Easton District, one to every seventeen.

Of these slaveholders many are found to treat their slaves well; perhaps slaves are not in the United States better fed or clothed

than in this portion of our territory. But we here speak of their treatment *as slaves*, not as men, or as human beings entitled by the law of God to take rank as men and as immortals.

“What do those men mean, who tell us of the *good treatment* of slaves? Is it, or can it be, good treatment of a *man*, a *woman*, or a *child*, to account, to repute, to deem, to adjudge them to be on a level with beasts, and articles of property? Do those who talk of the ‘good treatment’ of slaves intend to say or imply this? We may charitably presume that they do not. What, then, *do* they mean? The idea they have in mind, perhaps, may be this: Considering that these poor creatures *are* slaves, their treatment is as good as it could be expected to be—as good as the treatment of a *slave* can be. But the question again returns, whether it *is* good treatment of a man, a woman, or a child, to treat them *as slaves*? If not, then the plea of good treatment is illusory, and meets not the proper question to be considered in disposing either of the claims of slavery, or of the practice of slaveholding or the conduct of slaveholders.”

Of these church-members there are those who purchase and sell slaves as they do any other property—who buy them that they may avail themselves of their unpaid toil, and who sell them as embarrassment, good prices, or vices in the slave may be provocatives to their transfer to others or to the South.

Unless moral conviction of the inherent wrong in the *relation* of master and slave is taught and believed, it cannot be expected that Methodists will free themselves of the evil, or will not connect themselves voluntarily with slavery if at present free from it. Every passion of our fallen nature is addressed by slavery. Does one there wish to be regarded as wealthy in society? slaves must drive his carriage and wait upon his guests! Would he court political advancement? In order thereto, if a Methodist, he buys a slave, to show that he is orthodox in reference to the institution, though a member of a church professing to be opposed to slavery. We some time since heard of one who was a candidate for a certain position in the national legislature, who purchased a lot of slaves, and told of it on his tour as he stumped the District, as a proof of fealty to slavery.

The temptation addresses the poor Methodist, too, who may be but a renter of land, and who wishes to improve his circumstances rapidly. The easiest way to do which is to purchase a young and likely woman, the “increase” from whom, or from two such, in a short time comparatively, will make him the owner of force enough to till his rented acres, without having also to rent the labor for its cultivation.

Consenting to the fact that the relation is innocent in itself, which we do not, yet if such were true of the slaveholder, Quarles’s words

are most appropriate. The owner of human beings may indeed be addressed as one of whom it is true that—

“The close pursuer’s busy hands do plant
 Snares in thy substance; snares attend thy want;
 Snares in thy credit; snares in thy disgrace;
 Snares in thy high estate; snares in thy base;
 Snares tuck thy bed, and snares surround thy board;
 Snares watch thy thoughts, and snares attach thy word;
 Snares in thy quiet; snares in thy commotion;
 Snares in thy diet; snares in thy devotion;
 Snares lurk in thy resolves, snares in thy doubt;
 Snares lie within thy heart, and snares without;
 Snares are above thy head, and snares beneath;
 Snares in thy sickness, snares are in thy death.”

From what we have said of our Conference, one may arrive at some conclusion as to the question: What is the extent of slaveholding in the whole church? This question is not a recent one in the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was asked in the first year of the present century. It has been asked every year since. Answers have been attempted, and they have been to magnify or minify the number just as the argument suited, or the character of the inquirer demanded. If he was an abolitionist, he would very probably be told, even before the division of the church, that the number of slaveholders when compared to the whole number of church members, even in slaveholding States, was very small indeed, and when compared with the whole number of members in all the States and territories, they were but a fractional part, indeed a small one. To the ultra conservatist, who was hysterically fearful of endangering the unity of the church, representations were made of the most formidable character as to the number of slaveholders, and their influence in the church and in the community, until he became wrought up to frenzy at the bare idea of touching the question in any form so as to disturb the peace and harmony of the church. Thus the abolitionist’s zeal was quenched at the thought of the insignificance of the matter which had harrowed up his soul, and the conservatist became the apologist of slaveholding in the church, and joined the pro-slavery party against the extirpationist, and hunted him down with the cry of fanatical abolitionist.

This was a pleasing matter, and a very gratifying as well as prolific source of power to the pro-slavery portion of the church, as it commanded voices and votes where they were needed—in the councils of the church. Grown secure from the unfailing effect which the

argument of the fewness of the numbers of slaveholders now in the church, and the power of pro-slaveryism to rend it if not permitted to enjoy undisturbed quiet, it was not surprising that upon the appearance of "Pictures of Slavery," it was seen that Northern Methodists were aroused and alarmed.

Rev. J. D. Long, a member of the Conference, had in the summer of '57 published his "Pictures of Slavery," a work whose simple *naïveté* as to style would afford presumptive evidence of its truth, even were what he says not authenticated by a reputation as honorable for truth, as is his character above that of the man who can conceive of no loftier motives governing him in its publication, than those mercenary ones of which he may be conscious as influencing himself. He but came before the church and the world to bear his testimony against the wrong of oppression, authorized by State laws, and too subserviently deferred to and patronized by the church of which he was a minister. Scarcely does his book fall from the free press of his adopted State, Pennsylvania, ere a Brother Minister, under the horrid charge of "unchristian and unministerial conduct," tells him he will arraign him at the next Annual Conference.

We have heard Bro. Long abused in Philadelphia not a little for not staying on slave soil and publishing his sentiments on slavery. Perhaps the following may furnish his apology:—

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland, That after the passage of this act it shall not be lawful for any citizen of this State knowingly to make, print, or engrave, or aid in the making, printing, or engraving, within this State, any pictorial representation, or to write or print, or to aid in the writing or printing any pamphlet, newspaper, handbill or other paper of an inflammatory character, and having a tendency to excite discontent, or stir up insurrection amongst the people of color of this State, or of either of the other States or Territories of the United States, or knowingly to carry or send, or to aid in the carrying or sending the same for circulation amongst the inhabitants of either of the other States or Territories of the United States, and any person so offending shall be guilty of a felony, and shall on conviction be sentenced to confinement in the penitentiary of this State, for a period not less than ten nor more than twenty years, from the time of sentence pronounced on such person."—*Act passed Dec. 1831. See 2d Dorsey, page 1218.*

We fear "Pictures of Slavery" would excite "discontent" among the colored people of Md.; that is, if they could only read.

Such, however, was the quarter from which the announcement came, of the introduction of the question of slavery once more into the Philadelphia Annual Conference. The temerity shown in the fact that slavery or slaveholding interests, in church and state, were

to be protected at the sacrifice of a troubler of our slaveholding Israel, had found perhaps its food and other keep, if not its very being, in the document of the Wilmington Conference.

CHAPTER II.

Action of the Philadelphia Conference at its late session held at Easton, Pa.,
March 24, 1858.

AT the period when Rev. L. C. Matlack was rejected, because he was an abolitionist, upon application for admission into the body, the Philadelphia Conference introduced a standing question, which was annually asked candidates coming into full connection, and those admitted to the Conference on probation; as well as of ministers coming among us from other portions of the church. This question, according to the Pastoral Address of 1847, was, "Are you an abolitionist?" and the Address tells the truth when it says, "and without each one answered in the negative he was not received."

Another question was introduced in 1842 and 1843, namely, "Are you a slaveholder in any State which will allow emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy his freedom?" This question was asked old and young, first in the spring of 1843; the resolution of the Conference requiring it to be asked was passed in 1842. These questions were for many years continued, without any formal action of the Conference ordering them at each session.

It was a very common thing for any brother who chose to do so, to ask the Presiding Elder representing the case, whether the young brother up for admission was an abolitionist? We recollect it being thus asked by a member in regard to Rev. J. B. McCullough, and others; and the Presiding Elder in such cases would answer as to his knowledge in the case; and if he did not know, he would ask the senior colleague of the young preacher as to this point: and neither Presiding Elder, preacher, nor young preacher seemed to think there was any want of courtesy in the asking by any one, in order to satisfy a brother's mind on that subject. And so of the other question: "Are you a slaveholder?" This was put by the Conference through the Bishop at first for a few years, but afterwards the question was asked of the presiding elders: "Is the brother con-

nected with slavery?" and we never knew the question objected to as improper when information was sought touching young men or members of the Conference, or those coming up for deacon's or elder's orders as local preachers. The Presiding Elder invariably answered as to his knowledge, and as a part of his representation of the case when his attention was directed to it.

But the history of more than twenty years shows that the practice obtained of asking, "Are you an abolitionist?" or of the P. E., "Is he an abolitionist?" and since 1843 of asking, "Are you connected with slavery?" or, "Is he connected with slavery?" As late as 1852 we heard the question personally asked in the Conference of a brother who came up for admission, "Are you an abolitionist?"

Such were our Conference's antecedents when it met in Easton, Pa., on the 24th day of March last.

If a striking contrariety of conduct on the part of a large and influential Conference be now observed; if a strong contrast be presented to its usual course; if a great dissimilarity in its mode of action be apparent, these must have had causes; and the conduct of the majority must have been influenced by *reasons*. Whether those causes were the offspring of fear, lest overwhelming revelations would be made, or whether it was, as one told us since, "because it would have gratified abolitionists," we know one thing, that after all the blanketing, and disguises, and shutting out the daylight from ministerial connection with slavery, there peeped out enough to show that slaveholding was practised by persons in the Conference; and we leave to conjecture the task of estimating the amount, yet unknown, by seeing the character of the means employed, and by the unusual exertions put forth for the purpose of concealing the matter.

We shall have to judge of the whole continent by passing in our review only the headlands standing out in the way of our voyage, since forbidden a knowledge by interior explorations.

The class of the first year of young ministers being before the Conference for representation and continuance on probation, and it having been extensively circulated that one of that class was a slaveholder, Rev. J. D. Long asked in a certain case after the representation of the Presiding Elder had been heard, if the Presiding Elder knew "whether the brother was or was not connected with slavery?" There was no reply to this question; but, after his case had passed, a member of the Conference arose and said, that since the question

had been asked in regard to the brother, it might be necessary to say "that the young man was the son of one of our preachers, and could not be suspected of connection with slavery." Bp. Ames : "We don't know of what we may not be suspected now-a-days."

After several others had passed whom Bro. Long knew, one whom he did not know, from one of the slaveholding districts, came before the Conference for a vote of continuance on trial : Bro. Long asked the Presiding Elder of Easton District, as to whether he could say as to the brother's being free from connection with slavery ? The utmost interest seemed to spread over the Conference ; several members started to their feet, demanding to know "why he asked that question, and whether he had any proof that the brother was a slaveholder ?" To this Bro. Long replied, that he had asked the question for the reason that in the class of the first year, it had been said there was one or more brethren connected with slavery ; that in regard to one who had been discontinued at his own request, since he had asked the question before, it had been stated as a certain thing ; and that if the Presiding Elder knew in regard to the matter, he would feel obliged to him for the information.

Presiding Elder McCombs replied, that he had presented the case of the brother as fully as he judged was proper ; that he had stated that the young brother was promising and useful ; and that he had nothing further to say. This was said in a very decided and very dignified manner ; and, of course, was only a direct refusal to afford the desired information ; a matter perfectly within the province of prerogative, though not in accordance with the usages of the body ; yet had any other question implying necessarily no more suspicion against character than "slaveholding under certain circumstances" does, in the judgment of the majority of Conference, as will be seen, we think there would have been no hesitancy in replying to the question as to the Presiding Elder's knowledge in the case.

The assertion as to the impertinent character of the question, as intimated by one of the brethren, was replied to by the statement "that as to the propriety of asking the question, it was eminently proper at the present time ; that it was not a novel thing in the Conference to do much more than this ; that the time was when each member of the body from the oldest to the youngest, had been required to answer the questions personally as to his connection with slavery ; whereas in the present instance, it was only desired of the

Presiding Elder that he state his knowledge in reference to the matter as added to his representation in the case."

Question treated as unimportant or improper, by Bishop Ames and the Presiding Elder, the former taking the vote on the continuance of the brother whose name was before the body.

It might be asked, by some not familiar with the subject, why it was necessary to institute examinations into the relations of each preacher to slavery? The answer is easy! Because this slaveholding among preachers is a secret sin. It can be done, and be kept from the church for years. The Conference may never know of it; the Presiding Elder may never know of it; the slaveholding preacher's colleague on the same circuit may never know of it; *his own wife may never know of it until the death of her husband*. Then for the first time, in the will of her dead husband, she may find it out. When she married him, she may have little suspected she was marrying a slaveholder: throughout the years of wedded life in which she had been the companion of his itinerant career, she may never perhaps have thought of the guilty secret locked up in her husband's bosom; and even when she closes his eyes in death, she may not imagine she is closing the eyes of a slaveholder. We know of one case of comparatively recent date, in the Philadelphia Conference, in which every one of the items in the above series was a fact, and are prepared to establish them.

By hidden measures, by unsuspected tenures is this property holden; and it sometimes requires removal to another country, *via* Jordan, to reveal that the deceased has been for five years, or thirty-five, a slaveholding Methodist preacher.

On the morning of the *second day* of the Conference, Rev. J. Cunningham offered the following: "That a committee, consisting of one from each district, be appointed to examine and report as to the administration of the laws of the Discipline in regard to slavery within the bounds of the Conference." Upon its reading, considerable agitation was manifested, and upon an expression of desire by some member to the effect that no action be now taken upon it, Mr. Colclazer, Presiding Elder of Snow Hill District, moved to lay the resolution on the table, which was done very quickly. The author of the last motion, in reply to a question as to whether his resolution made the lying on the table temporary or permanent, said with emphasis: "I hope it will lie there forever!" Bro. Colclazer, some years ago, came from Michigan, we believe, and took up in the New

Jersey Conference, but found it convenient, after a subsequent session of that Conference, to ask for admission into the Philadelphia Conference; in which, after various fortune, he grew to be Presiding Elder of Snow Hill District, Md.

During the morning session of the same day of the Conference, upon the calling of the name of D. L. Titlow, on the list of the super-numeraries, J. M. McCarter arose and stated that, through the chair, he wished to ask the Presiding Elder as to whether Brother Titlow was connected with slavery? Hereupon considerable feeling was manifested by members of the Conference, and a discussion was entered into as to the right of a brother to ask that question in regard to another. It was contended that, if there were charges to present against a brother, they should be presented; but this question ought not to be asked. J. M. McCarter stated that "he asked only for the knowledge of the Presiding Elder, and for the reason that he had heard that the brother, who was not at the Conference, was connected with slavery, and he wished to know the character of that connection." After various speeches, the Bishop was called on to decide the matter of the propriety of the question, as a point of order. The Bishop stated that if anything was against a brother, it must be presented in formal charges; that if any brother wished to know a matter of this kind, he ought to go to him privately and ask him, but that this method was not the proper one. He said: "Suppose some brother should get up when a brother's name is called, and ask the Presiding Elder, who has said there is nothing against him: 'Did that brother wash his face this morning?' though there would not be much harm in asking the question, the inference would be drawn, perhaps, that the brother was not very cleanly in his habits." Laughter!!! Stamping, and cheers of "Good! Good!" Voice, "McCarter, there you caught it! you can sit down now." We understood the whole of what the Bishop had said as intended to prevent the question from being asked, and an attempt to throw ridicule upon the person asking it.

J. Cunningham here took the floor, and commenced speaking, upon the cessation of the hubbub, and, after some general remarks, said that he "was ashamed and astonished to hear such a witticism uttered upon such a question, and to hear it cheered by such a body of ministers:" (*turning to the Bishop*), "a question upon a subject such as would, were it possible, cause angels to weep, until *your* altar was baptized with their tears."

When Mr. Cunningham had ceased speaking, J. M. McCarter remarked that the question had once been in order in this Conference, and that he could not understand how it had grown to be either so improper or so trivial now; that it was once asked by the Conference of all its ministers, and that for years it had been regarded as a proper question; that it was now imperatively demanded that the Conference should exculpate itself from the suspicions attaching to it, because of the relation to slavery held by some of its members; that there was reason for it being done, in that it was not unknown to the Conference that one of our own members had died not long since, owning a number of slaves. Rev. P. Coombe—"Bro. McCarter, make the question a general one!" We had a resolution prepared, which we proposed to offer when the examination of the list of effective elders should come up, and at that stage presented it to be read by the secretary. It was as follows: "*Resolved*, that in the further examination of character, the members of this Conference shall, before retiring, make reply to the question 'Are you directly or indirectly connected with slavery?'" Bro. Coombe suggested its alteration to "Are you a slaveholder?" which was accepted.

Dr. I. T. Cooper objected to the passage of the resolution. He was not a slaveholder, but was ready to show that simple slaveholding was no offence; he went on extensively to prove it, and was demolishing the Discipline very rapidly and heroically, when Rev. G. Quigley could stand his friend's position and ruinous views no longer, and hastening from his distant seat on tiptoe, his head in a horizontal position, with great concern informed the Dr. that the Discipline forbade a travelling preacher to hold slaves. Dr. Cooper—"I am reminded that one of our rules forbids our ministers to hold slaves; but I mean that simple *benevolent* slaveholding is not forbidden, nor wrong."

Rev. Dr. Hodgson said that the brethren here were some of them fond of asking questions. It might be asked, Who is "Border?" and Who is "Junius?" Did not know that they were members of the Conference, but if they were, they ought not to be; and if this question were pressed, it might be that others would follow.

We would inform Dr. Hodgson that the probable author of the "Junius" letters in "Zion's Herald" has been ascertained, as was thought by the slaveholding stewards of Snow Hill Circuit, Md., to be Rev. Jos. S. Lane, their pastor, and they have answered his overwhelming facts, for which he now stands responsible, by driving him

off from that "land of the free and home of the brave." So that Dr. Hodgson will have a chance next spring to show that "Junius" ought not to be a member of the Conference, and get him turned out as unworthy of association with such good pro-slavery doctors in divinity as himself. A man who goes to God's Bible to find in it the higher law of the slave code, and who puts the relation of master and slave upon the like grounds of innocency as that of husband and wife, parent and child, and who considers it a lawful and proper relation for a Christian man, must certainly feel his purity endangered by Conference connection with such a persistent unbeliever as "Junius." Should "Border" turn up as a member of another Conference, the Dr., having had in the past some experience of going beyond his own Conference for the purpose of prosecuting abolitionists, may get a *carte blanche* thereto at our next session. We shall certainly give him our vote for such attorneyship.

Rev. James Cunningham differed from the former speakers in sentiment, though he numbered them among his personal friends. "How are we to reach this matter? If a better way than scrutiny before a charge can be shown, what is it?" The speaker was fully persuaded that the resolution proposed the only proper course in the premises. "The Conference once asked, Are you an abolitionist? and that not long since. Were it asked of me this morning, I would be happy to reply, *I am* an abolitionist! I want the world to know it. Let us have this question asked on the examination of character, for our protection as a body against slaveholders."

Br. Merrill arose and said: "I don't hesitate to state, and I should not be afraid to state if I were in the State of Maine, that I *am* connected with slavery, and I have no fears that I could satisfy any abolitionist, that my connection with it is wholly benevolent, could I have an opportunity."

On motion of Rev. W. McCombs, the resolution of the Conference of 1842 was offered as a substitute for the present question. It reads: "Are you a slaveholder in any State the laws of which will allow of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy his freedom?"

It was objected to by the writer because it did not place the matter where the Discipline does. That says nothing about enjoying freedom in the State, &c.; it says, "where emancipation is practicable."

This action of 1842 was largely discussed, when, on motion of Rev. P. Coombe, the substitute was laid upon the table.

Dr. Durbin then offered the following, which was accepted by the mover of the original question, and for which this was presented as a substitute: "Are you directly or indirectly a slaveholder contrary to the law of the Discipline, Chap. VII., paragraph 1?"

Dr. Anderson regarded this question in its present form and in all its forms as perfectly inquisitorial, and therefore moved that it be laid upon the table, which was done amidst clapping, stamping, and cheers; 93 voting in favor of laying the whole matter on the table, and 41 against.

The resolution of Rev. J. Cunningham, for the appointment of a Committee on Slavery, having laid on the table for a day, was now sought to be called up by Rev. N. Heston, who arose, and addressing the President, said: "Mr. President," in a clear and distinct voice. The Bishop, taking no notice of the speaker, put the question in regard to D. L. Titlow's character, and it passed. "Mr. President," again said Brother Heston; but Bishop Ames, still inattentive, called the name of another preacher. Here brother Cunningham, addressing the Bishop, said: "Bishop Ames, a brother addressed you." "I did not hear the brother; but we can't attend to these matters now; must attend to the minute business of the Conference." So manifest a disposition to override the anti-slavery men called up brother Cunningham again to his feet, who said: "But, Bishop, I think there is something due to a minority on this floor on this question." The Bishop did not seem to take any notice whatever of Brother Cunningham, but proceeded with the examination of character.

We find here the key-note of Conference action was struck, and all the subsequent action of the Conference was in perfect harmony therewith. Its language was: "We will shut out daylight, we will not follow our antecedents; we will trample down the action of '42; we will vote the Discipline itself on the table; though a member has avowed himself a slaveholder, and though our collective character labors under the suspicion of complicity with the 'sum of all villanies,' we will not take the *old* methods to protect ourselves from slaveholders, and we will take nothing *new* as a measure thereto." Was there not a cause? What was it? Let the after developments answer!

The case alluded to by the writer as the "one who died not long since who held slaves," is as follows: Rev. Jno. Bayne was an old member of the Conference, and served the church as a preacher in

the itinerancy for many years, generally in the slaveholding portions of her territory. He was taken ill and died while preacher in charge of Zion Circuit, Cecil Co., Md. The date of his death, as may be learned from our Annual Conference minutes, was August 6, 1852. He resided, as we learn, at the time of his death, about one and a half miles from the Pennsylvania line, and from the village known as the Brick Meeting House, part of which little village is in Chester Co., Pa., and part in Cecil Co., Md.

After his death a will, supposed to have been written in his sickness, and which was in his own handwriting, was found. In this will, after directing the disposal of his other effects, he speaks of *seven slaves, slaves for life*, who, by that last will and testament, are given their liberty. These slaves were midway down the Peninsula in Maryland, and were there hired out to various persons. The will was not signed by the deceased, and was not attested by witnesses. To establish its validity it was necessary to prove the handwriting of the deceased minister. Fortunately, Rev. Dr. Boone, a member of the Conference, now in Philadelphia, and who acted as his executor, succeeded in doing this through the agency of Rev. A. Manship, agent of the Tract Society of our Conference, and another individual. It appears that the deceased had given Brother Manship his first license to exhort some ten or twelve years before his death, and Brother Manship had retained that license, and besides that scrap of writing, had seen and was familiar with the handwriting of the deceased. Upon thus establishing the will, the intention of the deceased was thus carried out, and the slaves, after about one year from the time of his death, were permitted for the first time in all their lives to breathe the air of liberty.

We heard Mr. Manship describe the touching scene which a few days afterwards occurred on the highway, and after the validity of the will had been established, in part through his agency, upon his meeting one of the slaves of the deceased Methodist preacher. If we do not mistake, the woman, with a babe on her bosom, was passing along when met by Mr. M., who, recognizing and addressing her, said: "Mary, you are free!" "She looked at me," said he, "and could not seem to comprehend the intelligence. At last, when I told her of her master's will, of which she had not heard before, and how she, by that will, was made a free woman, she stood overwhelmed with her emotion for perhaps a moment after realizing the truth of what was said: and then, her pent-up feelings of joy found expres-

sion in great tears that rolled over her face, and fell upon her bosom. You should have seen that face and those tears, Bro. McCarter! and how she thanked me! and would have kissed my very feet for the news I brought her! and you may be sure I was very glad to be the bearer of such tidings!"

From this instance of the liberating of Bro. Bayne's slaves, one may see how easily the freeing of slaves by Methodists is accomplished; and how absurd the statement of those who would avoid the charge of want of faithfulness to our Discipline, in the appointment of slave-holders to office, when pressed by its law, which declares *ineligible* to office him who owns slaves where emancipation is practicable, and where the enjoyment of freedom is not legally prohibited.

The following liberal provisions of the State of Maryland in regard to emancipation ought to settle the matter of quibbling so often heard from apologizing preachers, who have helped to fill every office in the church with slaveholders, as well as their apologizing pro-slavery friends who are at so much pains to hunt excuses for them.

The existing law of Maryland on this subject, takes its date from the Act of 1796, ch. 67, the 29th section of which is in these words:—

Where any person or persons possessed of any slave or slaves, within this State, who are, or shall be, of healthy constitutions, and sound in mind and body, capable, by labor, to procure him or them sufficient food and raiment, with the requisite necessities of life, and not exceeding forty-five years of age; and such person or persons possessing such persons aforesaid may by writing under his, her, or their hand and seal, evidenced by two good and sufficient witnesses, at least, grant to such slave or slaves his, her, or their freedom; and any deed or writing whereby freedom shall be given or granted to any such slave, which shall be intended to take place in future, shall be good to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever, from the time that such freedom or manumission is intended to commence by the said deed or writing, so that such deed and writing be not in *prejudice of creditors*, and that such slave, at the time such freedom or manumission shall take place or commence, be not above the age aforesaid, and be able to work and gain a sufficient livelihood and maintenance, according to the true intent and meaning of this act, which instrument of writing shall be acknowledged before one justice of the peace of the county wherein the person or persons so granting such freedom shall reside, which justice shall indorse on the back of such instrument the time of the acknowledgment, and the party making the same, which he or they, or the parties concerned, shall cause to be entered among the records of the county court where the person or persons granting such freedom shall reside, within six months after the date of such instrument of writing; and the clerk of the respective county courts within the State shall, immediately upon the receipt of such instru-

ment, indorse the time of his receiving the same, and shall well and truly enroll such deed or instrument in a good and sufficient book, in folio, to be regularly alphabeted in the names of both parties, and to remain in the custody of the said clerk for the time being, among the records of the respective county courts; and that the said clerk shall, on the back of every such instrument, in a full, legible hand, make an indorsement of such enrolment, and also of the folio of the book in which the same shall be enrolled, and to such indorsement set his hand, the person or persons requiring such entry paying the usual and legal fees for the same." "Emancipation is also authorized by the same act, to be made by *last will and testament*, subject to the same restrictions which are imposed in case the emancipation is effected by deed, &c., agreeably to the above section."—*Ibid*, § 13.

In this State, a slave may be manumitted by *implication* contained in a last will and testament, as by a devise of real, or a bequest of personal property to a slave by his owner. (See *Hall vs. Mullin*, 5 *Harris and Johnson's Reports*, 190. *Stroud's Slave Laws*.)

The children of manumitted persons are not freed by the emancipation of the parents, unless expressly stipulated in the deed, will, or other instrument, by which the parents are freed.

To remove all doubt on this subject, as on some other nearly similar cases, it was enacted:—

"That from and after the first day of February, 1810, if any negro or mulatto female slave, by testament, or last will, or deed of manumission, shall be declared to be free after any given period of service, or at any stipulated age, or upon the performance of any condition, or on the event of any contingency, it shall be lawful for the person making such last will, &c. &c., to fix and determine in the same the state and condition of the issue that may be born of such a negro or mulatto female slave during their period of service." So far the act is judicious; but in the next section it is provided that, in the event that the testator, &c., shall not determine the condition of the issue so born, they shall be esteemed *slaves for life!!* (*Maryland Laws, Act of Nov. 1809, ch. 171.*) In Virginia, by the Code of 1849, the increase of any female emancipated by *deed or will* thereafter made, born between the death of the testator or the record of the deed, and the time when her right to the enjoyment of her freedom arrives, *shall also be free* at that time, *unless the deed or will otherwise provides*. Pp. 458–59.—*Stroud*.

In Virginia, there are no difficulties in the way of the *act* of emancipating slaves, though their re-enslavement follows, unless they quit it in twelve months after being made free. Various attempts have been made, since those enactments, to abridge the rights of persons in freeing their slaves in Maryland, and various interpretations have been contended for in regard to these enactments; but the following from an authority, in regard to a matter of fact, is with us decisive in regard to the present time: "There is no law in Maryland by which a manumitted slave can be reduced again to slavery. Slaves can be legally set free, and permitted to enjoy freedom in the State,

and instances of it are constantly occurring." (*Dr. T. E. Bond's Art. Methodist Episcopal Church South*, in *Methodist Quarterly*, July Number, 1851, p. 415.) Dr. Bond was a citizen of that State, was then a resident of Maryland, and he would not be likely to be in error. No new laws touching the matter have been enacted, we believe, since 1851, and we leave the subject, satisfied of the entire correctness of what we have written upon this point. Let the reader bear these matters in mind, in order to appreciate facts and allusions in the subsequent pages.

CASE OF REV. J. D. LONG.—The case of Rev. Jno. Dixon Long, author of "Pictures of Slavery," which had excited considerable attention in all portions of the Church, came before the Conference on the morning of the third day of its session. Mr. Long's book broke the silence which had so long reigned in the church upon two questions, often asked in all portions of the church above the border. Those questions were: "What is the character of the slave holding in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and what the degree of its prevalence?" In many respects, Mr. Long was admirably fitted for the task of giving correct answers to those questions in so far as his own Conference was concerned. During the whole eighteen years of his ministry he had lived and labored exclusively in our slave-holding territory. He was born and reared amidst slavery; had himself inherited a slave, which he freed upon his majority; was familiar with the workings of the institution in the church, and for many years had bestowed a large share of his ministerial labors upon the slave population of the State of Maryland.

He was impressed with the iniquity of slavery in the church, and felt it his duty to show the house of Wesley its sins of oppression. No man was better fitted by moral courage than he, to meet the issues of such a bold step when once taken. No considerations of policy, no amount of ridicule or abuse, no threats or persecutions, could daunt him or drive him from his positions. Yet his health was feeble; his constitution, never good, had long suffered from frequent attacks of illness. Frequent hemorrhages from the lungs left him exposed to death at almost any moment; yet his strong conviction of duty to the slave and to the church, impelled him to the task of showing what slavery was in our Conference, and made him conscious of ultimate triumph in all investigations touching what he had written as questions of fact. The writer of these pages had been selected

as that member of the Conference upon whom Bro. Long would rely to assist him, in connection with Rev. H. Mattison, of the Black River Conference, on the occasion of his threatened prosecution before the Philadelphia Annual Conference. We knew the character and amount of testimony he had prepared for meeting the charge and specifications against him, and we are confident that, with any degree of fairness in the trial, his positions in regard to our slaveholding could have been more than sustained. Not a stone was left unturned by his opponents in hunting up material for the business of crushing him; his trial, condemnation, and punishment, were anticipated by many. Forces were mustered; resolutions in the slaveholding portions of the territory were brought to Quarterly Conferences, to indorse the prosecution and its leader; the most absurd and wicked stories were put in circulation in regard to his character; Mr. Long was, almost in all circles, as well of ministers as of laymen, denounced as a fanatic, or as a lunatic.* But all would not do. Steadily accumulating materials, and influential names and facts came into Mr. Long's possession, to be used on his trial. Many of the ministers even from the slaveholding portions of our territory gave us their names and the leading points to which they were prepared to testify. The one question more important than all others—that of the want of administration of our laws on slavery as contained in the Book of Discipline—we had overwhelming proof to sustain.

The courage of the opponents of Mr. Long fell, until, when the day came, big with the fate of the Quigley prosecution, but one member of the Conference besides the author of the charges seemed anxious for the trial. Dr. I. T. Cooper, as we now recollect, was the only assistant who publicly, on the floor of the Conference, stood up to help Dr. Quigley in the advocacy of the propriety of the trial on those charges. A leading member of the Conference, since the adjournment of the body, thus writes of the attempted prosecution

* Dr. Quigley, it would seem, wished the Conference to follow the old method of treating such cases. He arranged to do it up apparently after the notion of the old medical writers. Hear what the magniloquent Reil writes on this point: "The reception of a lunatic should be amid the thunder of cannon; he should be introduced by night over a drawbridge, he laid hold of by Moors, thrust into a subterranean dungeon, and put into a bath with eels and other beasts."

And Lichtenberg, another *moral* philanthropist, sanctioned by the divine axiom, "the rod helps God," urges the employment of coercion and cruelty for this sublime psychological reason: that under the infliction of the lash and the cane, "the soul is forced to knit itself once more to that world from which the *evdgets* come."

on the Quigley charges: "The bill of charges presented by Dr. Quigley against Rev. J. D. Long was one of the most miserable abortions that ever dropped, living or dead, from the pen of a sensible man."

Let us briefly present the history of Conference action upon, and growing out of the presentation of the case.

When Mr. Long's name was called, Dr. Quigley presented the following:—

"I charge Rev. J. D. Long with unchristian and unministerial conduct in publishing various misrepresentations in a book entitled 'Pictures of Slavery.'"

Then followed the specifications of "Misrepresentation of the people of Delaware and Maryland;" "Misrepresentation of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Delaware and Maryland;" "Misrepresentation of the Ministers who have labored in Delaware and Maryland;" "Misrepresentation of the Philadelphia Annual Conference," and "Misrepresentation of the colored people of Delaware and Maryland," the pages which formed the basis of each specification being noted under each specification.

Quite a number of pages were given which had not been excepted to in the original Bill sent Mr. Long, in August last; the whole now amounting, as to the number of pages, to a formidable array.

Rev. J. Cunningham now arose and presented a Bill of exceptions, setting forth as the grounds of its being filed, various objections, such as indefiniteness in the specifications and inexpedience and impropriety on the part of the Conference in entertaining them. The session closing, the matter was not called up until after the interregnum of an intervening session, during all which time every influence was brought to bear on the friends of Mr. Long, by Dr. Durbin and others, to get them to say that they would vote not to entertain the charges of Dr. Quigley.

Mr. Long was earnestly desirous of bringing on the trial, confident of his triumph; he used every honorable argument, in private and on the Conference floor, to obtain the investigation; averred that he was fully prepared, and that justice to himself demanded, after being held up on a charge of unministerial character, that he should be permitted to refute it; that he and some of his friends had been at considerable trouble, and no little expense, to be ready; and closed by defying the slave power, and its sympathizers on the floor.

He protested against the course of his friend Brother Cunningham. In private, before the exceptions were offered, he entreated him not to offer them; and when offered, several of Mr. Long's friends joined him in asking Mr. Cunningham to withdraw them. But, though brother Long had no truer friend on that floor, and though there was no firmer or more thorough abolitionist in the Conference than he, duty to the Conference, which he would not see disgraced or laughed at over the length and breadth of the church and the country, required, as he thought, this course, and made him firm in his denial of Mr. Long's request.

How many bills of the same kind were in the hands of other members of the body we do not know. We think quite a number. We saw one in the hands of Dr. Durbin, which he had prepared to offer, had not brother Cunningham anticipated him, and read one in the hands of yet another brother which had been prepared in Philadelphia before the meeting of the Conference.

When, again, the Bishop called up the case, Brother Cunningham withdrew the former bill of exceptions, and presented one which was worded a little differently, but the same grounds were by it substantially covered. It reads as follows:—

"Whereas, The charges preferred by Rev. T. J. Quigley against Rev. J. D. Long, are unusual in form, indefinite in expression, and not personal as it regards the interests supposed to be involved in the complaint; and,

"Whereas, It is unseemly and unjust for the Conference to entertain a complaint of wrongs done to itself, and then proceed to hear and judge of the same; and,

"Whereas, The Conference, as a Conference, is not, and cannot be the guardians of the people of Maryland and Delaware; and,

"Whereas, It is unseemly and unjust for those members of that Conference who have labored in Maryland and Delaware to entertain complaints of wrong done to themselves, and then proceed to hear and judge of the same; and,

"Whereas, No member of the M. E. Church has preferred to the Conference in their own proper name, any charge against J. D. Long of wrong and injury done to himself or herself; and,

"Whereas, This Conference, as a Conference, is not, and cannot be the guardians of the interests and reputation of Maryland and Delaware: Therefore,

"Resolved, That the charges preferred by Rev. T. J. Quigley against Rev. J. D. Long, be not entertained."

Dr. Durbin urged the adoption of the resolution appended to the Bill upon the grounds set forth in the preliminary statements, and closed by declaring that, in a measure of this kind, he knew no man—no friend; that the church was more to him than any man; that

he could not stand by and see the church put between vast mill-stones and ground to powder.

Dr. Quigley replied in a feeble manner, not as to voice, but as to argument. Dr. Cooper got the floor, and, as usual, travelled all around about outside contingencies for a while, then plunged through all the proprieties of the debate and entered upon the discussion of injustice done him personally by giving his name to an extract in the book; that he had never signed an extract, etc., and spent the rest of the time until the hammer of the Bishop fell in telling what he was prepared to do, and to show, and to set forth, to demonstrate, and elucidate, and closed the endeavor, having accomplished for himself, we suspect—a great perspiration.

Dr. Hodgson, at this point, presented a substitute to the paper, as follows:—

Whereas, A member of this Conference, the Rev. J. D. Long, has written and caused to be published a book which, in the estimation of many, does injustice to the ministry and members of our church in Delaware and Maryland; and whereas charges have been presented against him before this body in relation to said book; and whereas the subject upon which it treats is one, the agitation of which, beyond the strict necessity of the case, is indiscreet and pernicious; and whereas, owing to indefiniteness in the specifications and other difficulties in the way of a thorough investigation of the merits of the book apparently insuperable: it is inexpedient for the Conference to entertain the charges: Therefore,

Resolved, That it would be judicious to select some other way of refuting and redressing the alleged misrepresentations and grievance.

Signed,

F. HODGSON,
J. MASON.

Rev. Messrs. Wm. Cooper, J. M. McCarter, J. Cunningham, I. T. Cooper, Dr. Durbin, and others, spoke on the resolutions. The vote on the question of adopting the substitute offered by Dr. Hodgson resulted as follows: affirmative 85, negative 42.

The character of Brother Long now passed by a large vote of the Conference. There were some who voted against it, but we do not know that it was particularly remarked by the chair. We did not hear any one of those, however, have his attention called to it afterwards by the President of the Conference.

Rev. J. Cunningham now stated that he wished to withdraw the paper asking for a committee on slavery, and which had not been acted on, and to present the following, which was handed to the secretary and read:—

Whereas, It is alleged in various quarters, and openly stated on this Con-

ference floor, that the administration of the discipline on the question of slavery is not satisfactory and faithful : Therefore,

Resolved, That a commission of seven members of this Conference be appointed to inquire fully and faithfully into the administration of the discipline in these respects, and report to this Conference at its next session, with such information touching the conclusions which they may reach, as in their judgment is necessary to explain and justify the same.

J. CUNNINGHAM,
J. CASTLE.

Dr. I. T. Cooper then offered a resolution as a substitute for Bro. Cunningham's paper, which, we regret to say, we could not get hold of. It was to this effect: That the Conference appoint a commission to examine "Pictures of Slavery," for the purpose of getting out of it material for a future prosecution of Rev. J. D. Long; and that the Conference give them a whole year to do it in. Upon the reading of this preamble and resolution, which caused indignant feelings in the bosom of every man not lost to shame, Bro. Cunningham, with a sense of insult such as a generous man feels, said: "Mr. President, I feel indignant at the course sought to be pursued towards Bro. Long and his book. Against his wishes, and the wishes of all Mr. Long's personal friends on this floor, I held in abeyance my personal friendship for Bro. Long, consented to forego certain ultimate triumph for him in case of his trial, and waived the tempting consideration of seeing, the more speedily by the means of that trial, the more rapid success of my principles as an abolitionist, because of my love for the honor of the church and of this Conference; an honor which, as all have seen who were not blinded by prejudices and led by a tyrant's desire to crush the man who has dared to tell the truth, would be seriously damaged by entertaining the charges which a few moments ago were voted down. But now this great Philadelphia Conference is asked, after voting down the prosecution of Dr. Quigley, to do what would be infamous in the extreme. It is not enough that, for a great part of the past year, this brother, in feeble health, was held up in charges as guilty of unchristian and unministerial conduct; that he should have prepared for open and honorable investigation before this Conference, and challenged trial at this session of the body; but now he must be put on the rack as to his character and book another whole year. If the Philadelphia Conference wishes to do an act of brutal violence, let the lion of pro-slavery loose now; let it seize, and shake, and crush this poor superannuated preacher at once; if it must have blood, hand over the victim peremptorily for the sacrifice! But let not this Conference

take a whole year secretly to work by committee to find pretences merely to obtain forms by which it is to be done. There will be others ready for the same fate, to which you may by this action be able to consign this brother. For myself, I here link my fate and name with that of J. D. Long! My destiny and his shall be embarked together in the great cause of which he is among us the representative—of him who, by the manner in which he has courted public investigation and defied the measures already defeated, deserves and must receive my homage for his character and his principles.”

The Chair suggested, in order to arrive at the best results, that a committee should be appointed to take charge of both the papers, and report thereon at a future time. The suggestion was adopted by the body, and on the next day or session reported as follows:—

“*Whereas* it is alleged in various quarters, and openly stated on this Conference floor, that the provisions of Discipline on the subject of slavery are not duly observed, both as it regards the connection of the members of this Conference with slavery, and the administration of the Discipline on this subject in the churches; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That it is desirable, for the peace and reputation of the church, that the true state of this matter should be ascertained.

“*Resolved*, That a commission of seven members of this Conference be appointed to inquire into the whole subject-matter of the same, and report to the next session of Conference.

“*Resolved*, That this commission shall be competent to inquire into any alleged facts in any publications which may have direct reference to the matter of this commission, that the whole subject may be thoroughly investigated.

“J. P. DURBIN,

“F. HODGSON,

“J. CASTLE.”

When the report was read, it raised a perfect hurricane of wrath. Rev. Dr. Quigley arose and charged the paper with calling the character of the Peninsula preachers in question; “that they were ready to meet openly and publicly any charges which the ultra abolitionists on this floor might choose to bring, but to raise a commission for the purpose of inquiring into the manner in which they had performed their duty was an outrage on their character; that he would rather have the whip of a Southern slaveholder cracked over his head than the whip of a modern abolitionist.” He went on to say that after all that had been done at this Conference, and after all the men from the Peninsula had been subjected to, he thought they should not be further subjected to inquisitorial commissions; that it was only to be done, or sought to be done, to gratify the whims of modern abo-

litionists and fanatics. He wished to know what meat these "Cæsars had fed upon, that they had grown so great" as to have this honor conferred upon these abolitionists, their rumors and suspicions. Dr. Quigley continued a long time in a strain of denunciation, in which he fully delivered himself, as we suppose, of all his *holy* indignation against "modern" ultra and all other shapes, sorts, and sizes of abolitionists.

So fierce and bitter was his onslaught that Bishop Ames tried to cool him, in his tirade against abolitionists, by saying, "I suppose we are all Bible abolitionists!"

[*All Bible abolitionists!* Yes, *Bible* anything, so it but has Biblical sanction. But thereby hangs a question! Apropos, the Onesimus case, with the pro-slavery interpretation! Ahem! The Rev. I. H. Torrence gave us an illustration "just in point." He appeared on the Conference floor as Secretary of the Pennsylvania Bible Society, about this period of Conference action, and said, in closing: "We ask the pro-slavery friends to circulate the Bible, because it says: 'Servants, obey your masters,' and for the anti-slavery friends, it says: 'As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.'" A very convenient book is the Bible, which, according to the above showing, would, at the mere pleasure of the interpreter, forge fetters for the slave, or be at work to break them. What a good thing the Bible is—to teach truth and duty! blowing hot and cold from *the mouth of the Lord* is not a very pious compliment, either to the book or its author, we opine, however!]

But we have another paper proposed to take the place of that offered by Dr. Durbin! One thoroughly *consistent* with all the former action of the body during this session. How magnanimous an offer it makes to those who felt it their duty to bring certain matters before them, and appear for their proof! What an enviable position to occupy—"censors of the Conference," prosecutors upon criminal charges against others;—and the Conference said that this was the only method in which, as to a matter involving the character and reputation of the whole body, it should be examined. The concession is *out* from their own action as to the truth of the want of administration. It must not be inquired into, and the administration shall not be brought up as a question of fact, but by criminal prosecution.

What the body would do even then, is indicated by the action on

the Quinn case, and especially in the case entitled "Excusable Sin." But here is the paper:—

Inasmuch as reports of a failure to execute the Discipline of our church, and to perform their duty as ministers, have been put in circulation by a member or members of this body, without any previous effort on their part to have a regular disciplinary investigation on the subject, Therefore,

Resolved, That we most sincerely and earnestly request such persons as may suspect any delinquency in these regards to exist, will hereafter prefer their charges against those members of this body whom they may judge criminal, in the manner specified by the discipline.

J. R. ANDERSON,
T. C. MURPHY.

Now, let this action of the Conference be summed up, and what do we see! What *we* think of it, if given in plain terms, might be regarded as greatly influenced by our relations to Brother Long, and by our active participation in all the action had in the case.

Take the following from one at a distance. Thus speaks the editor of the "Northwestern Christian Advocate:"—

"This large and talented body of ministers has placed itself before the church in rather an unenviable attitude. Let us glance at the facts as they stand. A member of a body, responsible for his words, writes and prints a book in which he charges, in substance, that mercenary slaveholding exists within the bounds of the Conference; that buying and selling men, women, and children is practised by church members, and no attempt made to discipline them; that slaveholders, in defiance of our law, are church officers; worse still, that Methodist ministers are implicated in the atrocious evil.

"These things were true or false. If false, the author deserved expulsion from the church as a wilful liar and slanderer. For, be it remembered, he spoke not upon the warrant of hearsay or second-hand testimony, but of actual knowledge. But the Conference *passed his character*; with his book open before them, they said, 'John Dixon Long is a good man, so far as we know,' and sent him forth with the indorsement of the Conference!

"But, if he is the good man the Conference makes him, then are not his statements, made, as he avers, upon his personal knowledge, to be received as true? If so, what goes with the assertion, 'There is little or no mercenary slave-holding in the church?'

"The dilemma was seen. It was seen that by indorsing Mr. Long, the Conference was putting its approval upon his book—for the preamble accompanying the motion to pass his character does not relieve the matter—and, like honest men, they said, 'We will know just how much of this matter is true—we will sift these allegations and bring out the facts as they are.' This was manly, and was what the church wanted, and the resolutions reported by the very able committee were surely quite fair. We gave them in our paper of April 21st, but beg leave again to place them before the reader:—

[Here is quoted the report by Drs. Durbin, Hodgson, and Castle : see p. 42.]

"We have said it was an able committee—that trio of names will com-

pare with any other three in our church. Was there anything unfair? anything dishonorable? What could have invoked the fierce storm which greeted those resolutions?

"Compromise has been defined that by which Satan is permitted to triumph over righteousness. We shall not affirm that such was the case at Easton on the 26th of March, but the following was adopted, we suppose, *as a compromise*—

[Here are given the preamble and resolution signed J. R. Anderson and T. C. Murphy. Of this paper, which was adopted, he says:]—

"Look at it, reader. If it be not a strange production, what is it? There is first an implied censure upon the member or members of the body who have 'put in circulation' certain reports, and yet those men had at that moment the indorsement of the Conference as good men and true!—It then urges that these men shall proceed hereafter to prefer charges, &c. Very good advice—and did they not do it? Did they not arrest the passage of more than one character, and were not the complaints ignored? What did the complaints amount to?

"The report of the committee spoke of the 'peace and reputation of the church,' and believed that both would be subserved by an open, candid, official examination into all the facts. So we believe, and we are sorry that our brethren have refused it. They will learn that peace cannot be secured by covering up wrong and whitewashing the vilest system beneath the sun. Peace cannot be had by refusing a reasonable request—made, in fact, by the whole church, that we might know how far our border work is mixed up with human slavery.

"We say, furthermore, brethren of the Philadelphia Conference, as you have refused this examination, you have shut us up to take, as *all the testimony we can get, the book of John D. Long, and your indorsement of his character is sufficient proof that its statements are reliable!* By the evidence, then, which it furnishes, must the anti-slavery spirit of the church be governed. By its statements of fact, the future action of the church must be measured!"

REV. W. QUINN'S CASE.—We now present a case which, to the writer's mind, is one of considerable importance, as illustrating what *freedom* is when given by a Methodist preacher to those who happen to be born without their consent *not* free, contrary to the Declaration of Independence.

A superannuated member of this Conference named Wm. Quinn, who owns I know not how many slaves, whom he manumits when they reach thirty-five years of age, was represented, when his case was called, by his Presiding Elder. After which Bro. Long arose, and stated that, from the son of Bro. Quinn, who had voluntarily told him of the matter, he had learned that he had taken a slave of his father's to Norfolk, Va., and there sold him; that he had written to Bro. Quinn some months since, informing him of what he had heard

and from whom, and asked an explanation of the affair; stating also, in his letter to Bro. Quinn, that in case no satisfactory explanation was given, he should object to the passage of his character, and state the reasons therefor to this session of the Conference. Bro. Long further said that he understood that, though Bro. Quinn was absent, Dr. Quigley was employed to take charge of his interests. Dr. Quigley stated that he had nothing to say in the matter, as he was only empowered to act, by the decision of the chair, in case *charges* were preferred against the character of Bro. Quinn. The chair suggested that the charges, if there were any, should be presented. Whereupon the following was handed to the secretary and read:—

“*Easton*, March 25, 1858.

“I charge Rev. Wm. Quinn, a supernumerary preacher of this body, with unchristian conduct.

“*Specification* —In selling, or having sold for his use, a slave.

(Signed)

J. D. LONG.”

Instead of proceeding to trial formally, in consequence of the absence of the defendant, Bro. Long now withdrew the charge, to get before the Conference the promised explanations. Dr. Quigley then read an explanatory letter from Bro. Quinn, to the effect that the boy in question was charged with theft, and that, had the case been brought before the Court, he would, by the laws of Md., have been sold into perpetual slavery out of the limits of the State; that the boy was sold for a term of years in Baltimore, Md., and not in Norfolk, Va.; and that the sale was an act of benevolence, because it prevented him being sold as a felon to the far South. The letter further went on to state that, in obedience to the action of the Conference of 1842, he had manumitted all his slaves; that he had in this manner freed more than seven thousand dollars' worth of servants, and did it “*for conscience sake*.” [The Bishop, at this point, repeated with solemnity, and great apparent commendation, the words, “for conscience sake,” adding the word “brethren.”] A letter from a justice of the peace, confirmatory of the points in the manumission of the sold boy was also read; and Rev. Joseph Smith, intimately acquainted with Bro. Quinn, confirmed the chief feature in the matter of freeing the colored people, telling us he did it at the age of thirty-five; that he had fixed that as the period of giving freedom to all his slaves, and that in this manner he had set free quite a number. The same thing was confirmed by other members of the Conference, who seemed really to regard the setting slaves free at this age as a work of supererogation much beyond the claim

which justice had upon Mr. Quinn—as one said while speaking in private of his benevolence, and in downright earnest: “The Discipline only calls for the preacher to manumit his slaves, and the law of Maryland will allow him to do it as late in life as forty-five; the Disciplinary requirement on the preacher would be fulfilled were he to do it at forty-four years and eleven months; but Bro. Quinn does it much earlier.”

So that in the Conference, and by its action, the law of our church, which requires the manumission of preachers’ slaves, is interpreted and acted on, as meaning that if a preacher goes and gets out papers of freedom to take effect when the baby of the slave mother is forty-four years of age, it would be a fulfilment of the law and “up to the rule”!

Let us recur now to the case of the sold “boy” for a moment. He was sold in Baltimore, to the negro trader, we suppose, and carried with him a copy of the deed of manumission entered on the Eastern Shore Court records, by his master.

Now we know what we say to be true, by the laws and practices in slave States, when we assert that the sold boy has nine chances in ten against his ever becoming free. Let these considerations be taken into the account.

First. That a colored skin is in the Slave States presumptive evidence, while it is out of the grave, that the man wearing it is not entitled to freedom, but is a Slave.

Secondly. That, contrary to the law of nations, and of common law, and directly in the face of the laws of nature, in a suit to recover freedom, the burden of proof is upon the plaintiff, and he must prove it by white witnesses, or by authentic papers from distant courts and records.

Thirdly. The slave must institute a suit through another, he appearing as ward; this is the only case in which he can appear in a civil suit in slave States, we believe. And the attempt must be to wrest his freedom from a master who may choose to keep him a slave for life. This suit requires a lawyer to undertake the case, money to pay the fees, and contiguity to a seat of justice; for if the negro live even in Maryland, he dare not leave the farm of his master without subjecting himself to cruel tortures; and his being found a few miles from home without a written permission, subjects him to arrest and imprisonment. But he may be carried and sold beyond the limits of the State by the negro trader, though against the law,

and then what are his papers worth to him? Indeed, when they were carried "in the hand" of Bro. Quinn's son to Baltimore, and the "boy" was sold, we suppose the deed of manumission was given to the negro trader upon the payment of the money, as his title to the slave for the number of years therein specified! Good, safe hands to put it in, one would suppose! the hands of a man-stealer by profession! And the "boy," what could he know about its contents even if given him? His good Methodist preacher master had, we suppose, taken care not to spoil the negro by teaching him to read!

And finally, in all the slave States suit for freedom is attended with obstacles so great as would deter from making the attempt, any one not blessed with a keen intellect and a most courageous heart made desperate. Even then, should not the poor negro be scared by this terrible fate, which in Georgia, and South Carolina, and other States, the laws have suspended over him? These say, if he fail to prove his freedom, and judgment be given against him, "the court is hereby empowered to inflict such corporal punishment, not extending to life or limb, as the court shall in its discretion think fit," "if death should happen, in giving this moderate correction," it will be no crime. (See *Stroud, Slave Laws, Art. "A slave cannot be a party to a civil suit."*)

Upon the manifest injustice and cruelty of holding his grown slaves and their children until thirty-five years of age, a debate sprung up in which Rev. T. Sumption pronounced such holding as the worst kind of slavery, and was followed by others in the same strain. The following resolution was then offered by Dr. Durbin, and passed:—

Resolved, That the character of Rev. Wm. Quinn be passed, and that the inquiry into what he has done in reference to manumitting his slaves, in pursuance to his promise to the Conference at its session of 1842, be referred to a commission to be hereafter appointed, to ascertain the facts and particulars in the case, and report the same to the Conference at its next session.

The anti-slavery men of the body being in a minority, and acting throughout in respect to the several cases of those who were connected with slavery, felt, and were satisfied that all the church or its Great Head could hold them responsible for doing under the circumstances was to bring the known cases of such connection to the attention of the Conference.

There ought, we now think, to have been a division of the resolution just spoken of; the points of the passage of character, and the appointment of a committee of inquiry should have been dissociated;

but, as one of the anti-slavery members, we, from the manifested temper of the majority, were fearful that, unless the passage of Mr. Quinn's character was conceded in connection with the appointment of a committee of inquiry, the latter could not have been obtained. How well founded was our conjecture, then, may be seen in the fact that, on the last session and day of the Conference, the committee to inquire, or commission to ascertain, as above noted, was taken off the case of Bro. Quinn.

Now, let us look at the several features of the case of Wm. Quinn for an insight into the practical workings of our chapter on slavery, second paragraph or section. It reads as follows: "Whenever a travelling preacher becomes the owner of a slave or slaves by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our church unless he shall execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slave or slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives." Bro. Quinn and several other slaveholders were caught in the violation of the above law of the discipline, after a whole year's warning that the question would be asked the next year after the resolutions of 1842, as the records of the Conference will show. He was asked, in the spring of 1843, the question, "Are you a slaveholder?" he confessed the fact in open Conference; and that Conference instructed him to free his slaves. In his letter, read by Dr. Quigley, he tells of his compliance with the direction of the Conference. But in what manner did he comply? He gets a deed of manumission for each one, which emancipates his slaves, according to the testimony of one or more preachers who know him well, and knew too of these great acts of benevolence, at the age of *thirty-five years*—four years, at least, beyond the average lifetime of a generation of unconstrained laborers; and then lets the right hand know, with a vengeance, what the left hand, or left-handed benevolence, has done "for conscience' sake." But this is not all the truth. The children of these colored people, who are probably, most of them, members of the same church with their benevolent master, are kept in bondage for the same period as their parents; and *their* children after them take up their parents' sad tasks and condition, and thus this eternal grinding "of the faces of the poor" goes on in the "light of all Israel and the sun," without even the slightest rebuke from the Conference, from generation to generation. O God, thou art witness that some in our Conference are not the patrons of this oppression!

Female slaves begin to bear children in very early life. While laboring in the slave portions of our territory, more than one master pointed out to me the slave mother under sixteen, with a babe often her own color; sometimes many approaches towards her master's, incredible as it may seem. Putting the periods of birth two years apart, and supposing the maternal parent to live long enough to obtain the boon of the master's benevolence, she will have borne him, the master, not the husband, "a likely gang, say eight or nine head," adopting a Southern and very *huemane* mode of speech in reference to these specimens of human cattle. Suppose Mr. Quinn holds twenty or twenty-five slaves, among whom are six who are equally prolific; the amount of product may be easily calculated. The probabilities are, that this productiveness diminishes at or near the period when they are freed. This whole troop of young and likely slaves are to follow on the track of their parents, and to be followed by the winding caravan of on-coming generations, who are to travel the desert sands of this Sahara of Slavery, or rather this Wilderness of *Sin*, for five-and-thirty years ere the Canaan of freedom is gained. But how many die slaves far back in the wilderness, and how many die along the track of their travel, and how many with the goal in sight, and how few there are who drag their toil-worn carcasses just on to the banks of freedom's Canaan, to mutter a thanksgiving to Heaven and a Methodist preacher that they die free, it would require Bro. Quinn's statistics to tell.

Nor is this all! These on-coming generations may lapse into perpetual slavery, as thus prospectively held, by the death of the master. The slave child, born an hour after the master dies, or for whom being born he has not provided before his death, falls into the condition of perpetual slavery, and is left to heirs who may have no sympathy with freedom. Or, if any one of them grows up in slavery to be a thief (and *fur* and slave were synonyms with the old Romans who held white slaves), and he is taken up, tried, and convicted therefor, by the court; the laws of Maryland will sell him into perpetual slavery beyond the limits of the State; and, after deducting fees, hand over to the master the quota remaining. In some cases, several hundred dollars are thus realized. Thus the law treats manumission in case of conviction as a felon! To these accidents, upon deprivation by death of even the kindest master, are the offspring of slaves reduced should he but thus hold their progenitors; and to

this fate, even while the master is living, if betrayed into crime, is the slave though manumitted given over by law.

Ought travelling preachers *thus* to hold slaves? Ought they thus to rear slaves for others after them? Is all this up to the rule? Is the administration faithful in regard to preachers in all this receiving of the proceeds of the unpaid toil of human beings for fourteen years, or even for one hour—is all this according to the laws of the church? We have heard those who held their slaves for life, and treated them well as slaves, scoff at the idea of giving freedom to a slave when the habits of life for thirty-five or forty years had taught them to lean on the directing mind of another. This, in many cases, unfits them, thus late in life, for freedom. Yet this is anti-slavery—hatred to slavery! Even a benevolent way of disposing of an evil providentially inflicted!!!

What is slavery, if *this* be freedom! Is there any more extirpation in the case of such manumission than in that of perpetual slavery, into which it is in danger of relapsing in regard to the manumitted, for petty crime; and in regard to the children of the manumitted upon the decease of the present master?

Now this case is thus fixed up for the "Christian Advocate and Journal," perhaps by a member of the Conference: "One supernumerary preacher, indeed, had fixed a late period of life for the freedom of those in his possession, and strong exceptions were taken to his course; but the Conference failed to fix any definite time for their liberty, judging no doubt that the general expression of sentiment given in debate could not fail to correct any error into which the brother might have fallen." What a Methodist "Methodist" must be! And all the rest of his Philadelphia letter is indicative of the same elevated and far-seeing morality.

Between the representations of that letter, signed "Methodist," and the conclusions to which the writer arrived from the developments at our Conference, there is all the difference imaginable.

We remember to have read, in the legendary Edda of the Norse people, how one of their sea-kings, high in the favor of Aegir, the sea jotun, was given a wondrous craft. The story goes on to say that its possessor could fold it up like a small piece of parchment, and put it in his pocket. Yet, when the king wished to leave the white bosom and soft dalliance of his golden-haired queen for the swelling billows, on which and on the distant shore he performed the exploits which made him a hero whose prowess was the admiration of

his subjects, he would walk down to the dashing surf, his long line of warriors at his back bearing necessities for his voyage, and thus would he take his departure. Carefully unfolding the miniature ship, he laid its tiny keel on the water; when it distended to the size of the foot which was advanced from the shore. That one in, there was room for the other, then for the hero's person; then for another and another of his warriors, until all were embarked, with means of good cheer and their implements of sanguinary battle. Soon hull, masts, and sails were out of sight, as it careered on its way o'er the ocean; and the Aegir's ship disappeared from the sight of the watching queen, to greet it again when returning laden with the spoils of distant shores.

If the communication from "Methodist" *really* related to the late session of the Philadelphia Conference, there is all the difference between his conceptions of that Conference and our estimate of it, which existed between that ship in the pocket and the same craft on the sea, laden with its conquering heroes and their stores of plunder.

The following significant items of fact close the case. The ordered commission was never appointed either by the Bishop or the Conference; and it hung day after day, until, at the close of the Conference, it was called up, and voted on the table. This was the only matter in which the Conference had, by its action, laid itself open to the suspicion of anti-slavery tendencies for the future, but this was only a momentary impulse, and the body relapsed into its characteristic *status* by the easy work for its majority, that of laying it on the table.

Immediately after the passage of Mr. Quinn's character, the following resolution was offered and laid upon the table for future action with considerable enthusiasm:—

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Conference that its requisition upon *its members* to manumit their slaves, according to the Discipline, shall be twenty-one years, or under.

J. CUNNINGHAM,
C. I. THOMPSON.

Rev. Mr. Cunningham, after trying twice in vain to get the above resolution before the Conference at subsequent sessions, at length, toward the close of the Conference, succeeded, when the Conference, declaring that this was not their "sense," refused to take it up by a large majority, accompanied with demonstrations of great satisfaction.

REV. W. WARNER'S CONNECTION WITH SLAVERY.—Upon this gentleman's name being called, he arose and stated that he had inherited slaves; but he did not state how many. He stated also that he had

learned that the matter would be brought out at this Conference, and had in his possession on the floor of the Conference the certificates of the truth of what he was about to state. "Before I was admitted to the Conference, I went and had recorded a deed of manumission for all my slaves. My men slaves are to be free as each one arrives at twenty-eight years of age; and my women slaves as they arrive at twenty-five; their children I hold to the same respective ages when they are to be free." Brother Warner then went on to state that the Bible and the Discipline would bear him out in his connection with slavery, and that he regarded himself as living up to both in this matter.

Brother Long said: "Mr. President, I object to the passage of Brother Warner's character, for the reason that I do not think any one has a right to take the unpaid toil of men and women after they are twenty-one years of age." Interrupted by the Chair, who said: "We will pass the case for the present, it can be called up again." But it never was called up, and no vote of the Conference was put by Bishop Ames for the passage of his character, though its passage was objected to in open Conference. The same was done in another case, and disposed of in like manner.

Let us examine this case further. Brother Warner stated that he held the children of these slaves until they (whether in existence or to be born) arrived at the same age as that at which their parents were made free, but did not tell us about the second, third, and fourth generations, probably because their management will be in other hands, and worse ones than those of Brother Warner.

Now we present the following points, showing the wrong and injustice of this mode of holding slaves:—

First. What right has Brother Warner to hold slaves one hour, not to say for twenty-five and twenty-eight years? To hold a human being in slavery, after he comes into possession, one hour beyond the moment when a Methodist preacher could wash his hands of the business, is a clear infraction of the Discipline.

Secondly. To hold a human being one hour under the laws pertaining to them as slaves, is unrighteousness. What are these laws? What the *power* as master assumed in the holding of a human being as a slave? It has been thus stated by Dr. Breckenridge, formerly of Maryland. It is such power as—

"1. To deprive them of the entire earnings of their own labor, except only so much as is necessary to continue labor itself, by continuing healthy existence—thus committing *clear robbery*.

"2. To reduce them to the necessity of universal concubinage, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage—thus breaking up the dearest relations of life, and encouraging *universal prostitution*.

"3. To deprive them of the means and opportunities of moral and intellectual culture; in many States making it a high penal offence to teach them to read—thus *perpetuating* whatever evil there is that proceeds from ignorance.

"4. To set up between parents and their children an authority higher than the impulse of nature and the *laws of God*, which breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and at pleasure separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child—thus abrogating the clear laws of nature, thus outraging all decency and justice, and degrading and oppressing thousands upon thousands of beings created, like themselves, in the image of the Most High God. THIS IS SLAVERY, as it is daily exhibited in every slave State."

I do not say that Brother Warner would, or *actively does*, all that the law permits or empowers him to do. He takes the earnings of his slave men until twenty-eight, and he holds them as property in the legal sense, and pays taxes for them as property every year he lives. And he, by such payment and relation, sets an evil example, and his influence is counted as so much patronage to a guiltier slaveholding. As to the slaves he holds, the terrible *fact that they are slaves* continues until twenty-five and twenty-eight years old, with his permission, nay, by his act. This is *enslaving* men, women and children, and their on-coming generations for twenty-five and twenty-eight years. If one-half or one-fourth of the children born of these slaves die before arriving at that specified age, *they die slaves, and pass to eternity as the slaves of Wm. Warner*. This is prospectively enslaving unborn children too! Instead of letting them go out with their parents, their parents go out from under the yoke without them—leave them behind. The slave woman who gives birth to a child the day before she is free, has to suckle a slave child as a free woman. To claim it as her own, and carry it off, would be to steal Rev. Mr. Warner's property. This is enslaving to all intents and purposes.

"Enslaving men is reducing them to articles of property—making free agents chattels—converting persons into things. A slave is one held in this condition. In law, 'he owns nothing, and can acquire nothing.' His right to himself is abrogated. If he says 'My hands,' 'My body,' 'My mind,' 'Myself,' they are figures of speech. To use himself for his own good is a crime. To keep what he earns is stealing. To take his body into his own keeping is insurrection. In a word, the profit of his master is made the end of his being, and he is a mere means to that end—a mere means to an end into which his interests do not enter, of which they constitute no portion."—*Theodore Weld*.

Again: there is, in this kind of emancipation, no more extirpation of slavery, than in holding slaves for life; the root of the evil principle is there, and extirpation "cuts up by the roots."

Finally, it looks as though the object of thus holding was purely mercenary, as freedom is given only after the fecundity of the parent slave has furnished new material in the shape of blood, bones, and sinews, animated with life, to take the places of those who have already been slaves to a Methodist preacher too long. All the time, too, of their continuance in slavery they are liable for the simple act of theft, to be taken up and sold into perpetual slavery by the State. Can any truly good man, who will think the matter over, consent to hold slaves liable to such incidents?

All the features and incidents pointed out in the case of Mr. Quinn's slaves, with the exception that they cease to be slaves at an earlier age, inhere in the case of Brother Warner. I do not say of this brother that he did not speak truly as to his conviction, when he claimed that both Bible and Discipline allowed the practice of slavekeeping of this kind. His convictions are his own; but the Conference ought to ask him to do better in this matter. We commend to him the following, as expressive of all proper notions of justice in regard to the matter:—

"Persevere in representing, boldly and unceasingly, the right which the negro has to emancipation, and the utter unlawfulness of that system of spoliation and plunder which first made him a slave, and still continues him so—I say unlawfulness, in the most precise sense of that term. No law which man can enact can give one a right over the compulsory labor of another, except as the punishment of crime proved by evidence. I say it advisedly, no man has any lawful property in the labor of another, except by free compact."—*Lord Nugent*.

Or the words of Jno. Wesley:—

"But waiving, for the present, all other considerations, I strike at the root of this complicated villainy. I absolutely deny *all* slaveholding to be consistent with any degree of natural justice."—*Works*, vol. vi. p. 286.

Of the other cases of connection with slavery which were presented at Conference, it is but just to remark that they seem to differ in the one feature, that they hold, or that benefits inure to them from the holding of human beings in slavery for a term of years, *not by their own act*, but involuntarily as they claimed; whereas those cases we have presented indicate the personal convictions of the individual; and the term of years and the enslaving of children are their own act and deed.

Just in so far as one receives and appropriates to his own use the product of the unpaid toil of human beings, and just in so far as

he has a control which he does not, or will not exercise, to free at once those laboring without "free compact," just in so far is he a partaker in the sin and shame of oppression."

AGENT FOR THE BALTIMORE PAPER.—During the session of Friday morning, Rev. W. T. D. Clemm, of the Baltimore Conference, was introduced. He said: "I come here, brethren, appointed by the Baltimore Conference at its late session, to ask the individual co-operation of members of this body in circulating a new paper which the Conference, at its late session, proposed to publish in Baltimore. Dr. Stevens claims to have suggested the idea of the new paper; he takes credit upon that account; but, now that there is a probability of its consummation, he throws over it suspicion by the remarks made by him in regard to the enterprise, as though there was in the movement an incipient step taken towards the dismemberment of the church for the third time. The course which he is pursuing towards it may occasion the very disaster which he affects to deplore. Methodism was launched in Baltimore; and Baltimore has heretofore had a noble history as to her fealty to the interests of the church. She is willing now to take the North in her right hand and the South in her left, and hold them together." He then went on to point out the territory over which no religious periodical of the kind desired was circulated; gave some startling statistics as to the circulation of the Advocate when compared with the amount of membership; and stated that over much of that territory papers from the Church South were circulating, which had the effect of detaching the sentiment of many of our people from us; that in these papers upon the exciting question of slavery, the position of the Baltimore Conference was constantly misrepresented, and a paper was needed for the purpose of correcting those positions. "We do not purpose to establish a controversial paper—to draw the sword and strike with its naked edge, but merely to maintain our own positions and educate our own people. In much of our territory the administration of our present laws on slavery, as found in the Discipline, is found to be impracticable; and we presume the same is true of much of your own. We could not now refuse, in the Baltimore Conference, to ordain a local preacher if he came up recommended to our annual Conference, upon the ground that he was a slaveholder; and perhaps this is also true of this Conference." [At this point a voice said, "Yes, we could," in a feeble tone.] He did

not ask Conference action touching the matter, but proposed that brethren favorable to the movement would give their own names, and, as they passed around their circuits the first time, should present the matter to their members, and send the result to ——— Baltimore, and the paper would be sent.

Mr. Clemm's speech was marked with frankness, and a noticeable degree of observation as to the true state of affairs respecting the administration of the Discipline on slavery. His speech, it was remarked, was "thunder and live lightning, too," in the gifts of material and facts which the anti-slavery men of the Conference had already a great store of, to prove our want of fealty to our laws, notwithstanding the beliefs and assertions of men who are insulted if those are not taken and your own knowledge from personal observation discarded.

REV. J. R. MERRILL'S CASE AS TO CONNECTION WITH SLAVERY.—

This was a case of holding a boy as a slave for life, and Mr. Merrill, at a previous stage of the Conference, had *magnanimously* confessed himself a slaveholder ; and that while the question of again bringing up an examination into the character and relations of the members of the Conference to slavery was earnestly opposed. When his name was called, upon the examination of character, he arose and said : "Mr. President, I stated the other day that I was connected with slavery, and that I would be willing to say so if I were in the State of Maine ; and that I could convince any abolitionists that my slaveholding was benevolent. Some four or five years ago I came into possession of a man, a slave for life. I sent word to him, by some one, to be a good servant, and I would, when I came down to that neighborhood, give him his manumission. When I went to see after the matter, I found that there was a great prejudice in the neighborhood against my freeing him, in consequence of his being a drunkard. I ordered the man to whom he was hired to let him have one-half of his wages, instead of paying the whole to me. I told him that he must reform or I could not set him free, as all the people were opposed to it. Now I did not set him free because, first, it would be worse for the slave ; and secondly, because setting him free would injure the cause of emancipation, which Brother Long, the man of one idea, and those other abolitionists, profess to love so well. I believe his condition as a slave is best for him ; for, if I would set him free, he would soon be pointed at as a specimen of

‘free niggers.’ But if the Conference say so, I will take measures to get his freedom for him; but, as I said before, my judgment is that his present condition is best for him.”

To which Rev. J. D. Long thus replied: “Mr. President, I suppose this is a clear case of sanctified slaveholding in a Methodist travelling preacher. Bro. Merrill says the slave is a drunkard. Perhaps his *state* is the explanation of his crime. Seeing himself held in perpetual slavery by his owner—a Methodist preacher—he may have been driven to despair by his condition, and has sought to drown his troubles in drunkenness. I think that is a very natural explanation of the matter. As to the allusion of Bro. Merrill to myself by name, and his calling me an abolitionist, I have only to say I am an abolitionist, and thank him for calling me one; and I had rather be a man of one idea—a *great idea*—than to be a man of a thousand little ones.”

Dr. Hodgson said: “The brother has avowed himself as willing rather to be a man of one great idea, than a thousand little ones. If one idea can make so great a man as is Mr. Long, I suppose two would send him up like a balloon!” [Laughter.]

Mr. Long rejoined, “Yes, and take up a cotton doctor of divinity with me!” [Laughter.] The joke changed hands suddenly.

Rev. W. Cooper thought that he could appreciate the benevolence of Bro. Merrill; but, as the Discipline forbids the travelling preacher to hold slaves in that way, he thought, if he did not let the slave go, the Conference would feel itself obliged to let him go. [Laughter.]

Bishop Ames here called another name, and the Presiding Elder replied; whereupon a member of the Conference said:—

“I move that it is the sense of this Conference that Bro. Merrill should manumit his slave!”

This motion was carried in this case. So it was in Mr. Quinn’s sixteen years ago; and in Bro. Bayne’s fifteen years ago. Of this case, so far as any definite action is concerned in the matter on the part of the Conference, fifteen years hereafter, it may be said, if Bro. Merrill so choose to interpret his duty, and it should then be brought up as “Methodist” says of Bro. Quinn’s case, in “Philadelphia Correspondence” of the “Christian Advocate and Journal:” But, as the Conference indicated no specified time in which the brother should free his slaves, any little error in the matter of holding will, it is thought, be attended to. We suppose it was upon

this case the following assertion was predicated by the writer we have just quoted.

It was also conclusively shown that no slaveholder would be tolerated in the Conference. Every minister save one (and he held only one slave for his good, and was perfectly willing to set him free on the responsibility of the Conference, and was instructed so to do), had preserved himself free from this evil. Wherever one had become providentially connected with it, he had executed deeds of manumission on the behalf of his slaves.

Then Bros. Quinn and Warner are not slaveholders, if that "was shown." How did it happen to be shown that even one slaveholder was in the Conference? Because Bro. Merrill had voluntarily put his secret in the hands of a brother some time back, who he knew now was an abolitionist on the floor of the Conference. He was known somehow to be a slaveholder, and had not kept it "dead secret." Yet according to his own confession, he had been living the life of a slaveholder for four or five years in violation of the Discipline. Did the Conference intimate to him in any shape the slightest censure for having so lived?

As to the *benevolence* covering the *sin*, that is sheer stupidity, or worse! Every slaveholder we have ever known has the same plea of benevolence; and we once heard a *nègro trader* in Centreville, Md., contend that his was a *benevolent* business, and he made out as good a case in our judgment as did J. R. Merrill in his speech at Easton Conference. Two of the arguments of the trader were: that it was a benevolence because slaves in Queen Anne's Co., Md., were spoiled and corrupted by the free negroes; and he carried them where they were not liable to be corrupted by free "niggers." The second was, the "nigger" slaves there had a hankering after freedom which made them unhappy, because so many of their own color were free, and they were so close to a free State; whereas both these evils were obviated by his removing them where neither free negroes, free States, nor freedom troubled them so much; and thus he did a work of benevolence in lessening their cause of trouble.

As to the statement that these were the only ones "providentially connected" with sin, we should like to know how any man valuing his reputation could so write. "Every minister, save one, had preserved himself free from this evil." This is a monstrous assumption proclaimed as a fact. How does "Methodist" know this? No knowledge, but that which is intuitive or infinite, dare assert that as a fact, in the absence of all examination. The writer, with means of knowing which are at least equal to "Methodist's," would not be

surprised to find that there were ten! But this examination was objected to and voted down by men who hate "two kindred institutions, Slavery and the Inquisition!" Kindred institutions they are, but what would "Methodist" say if the Inquisition was a fact, and by some regarded as a "constitutional" matter in the church! tolerated in the church! having abased fifteen thousand victims to gloat its cruelty upon at this moment, and five thousand agents working its vengeance upon them! Would "Methodist" cover it up, all up, in soft words, as he has done the connection of our ministers with slavery! For one, we believe the man who could treat slavery and oppression with soft words and apologies, could so treat the other if equally a claimant on his patronage; and do it because of the law of "kindred." Strange, too, that "providential connection" with an evil should be self-inflicted for thirty-five, thirty, twenty-and-eight, and twenty-five years, and that it should appropriate unborn generations as the agents of this infliction!! Oh! Absurdity, how diminutive art thou in the presence of this Great Absurd of pro-slavery Christianity and its *protégés*!

The fact is, no man knows or can know who are slaveholders in the body, either as a holder of a slave for life, as Mr. Merrill was, or for thirty-five years, as Mr. Quinn has been. Cases like these may exist to an extent which would overtop the largest estimate we could now give as to probable numbers.

This whole business of emancipation is with many the merest subterfuge. It is a convenient mode of protecting one's self from the sentiment against slavery yet found among our people who are not slaveholders.

This will appear from the practice of many under the laws of Maryland respecting the emancipation of slaves.

The laws prevent emancipation after the age of forty-five years, for the reason that to free them after that age would operate as injustice to the slave in his or her old age, or for the purpose of keeping the slaves thus freed out of the county almshouses, where they must go if unable to provide for themselves, and where they must be supported at the public expense. The person may hold the slave until forty-four years eleven months and twenty-seven days, and thus be inside the period beyond which emancipation by law would be impracticable. Many of those who are freed are thus given their liberty; and the matter is set down by the pious owner to the credit of generous promptings. We have more than once heard those emancipators who came near the utmost limit to which they could go

in the holding of slaves if ever freed, calculate at Virginia and even New Orleans prices current of the inhuman stock market, the value of their chattels at the time when freedom was given them ; and set down the sum of dollars which they regarded as a contribution equally with gifts to the Missionary Treasury.

Again, we have noted as a matter of easy explanation that female slaves were oftener kept in bondage until late periods than the males. The reason is obvious : the former, in slave-breeding States, such as Maryland, are valuable as long as they continue to bear children, and as any child born after freedom was given the mother, followed her condition as free, it would of course be dead loss, or rather be calculated in as benevolent contribution.

Now, of course, there are many slaveholders who do not take the whole of the period allotted, and proceeding on the basis of calculation already intimated, and accepting the slave law maxim "the child follows the condition of the mother," the benevolence is the greater as indefinitely extended through the generations of the product of female slaves who may have had children of that sex after freedom.

Thus, for instance, suppose a Methodist slaveholder manumit his slave woman to be free at forty, and she should have two female children afterward, these would be worth, say seven hundred dollars each, at 18 years of age ; the cost of rearing to that age has been paid, and a surplus over in the master's hands ; as the chief items for rearing children, food and clothes, cost say 20 dollars a year, which we will suppose is paid for in labor at 17 or 18 years old.

Say as a matter of contribution on the ground precisely upon which we have more than once heard the claim set up,

Mother worth in the market at 40 years old	\$200
Two female children or males at 18 do.	1400
If the former, then their children 6 each at do.	8400

\$10,000

Deduct risk	1000
-------------	------

So that the snug little sum of	\$9000
--------------------------------	--------

is given as a benevolence by setting free one woman, in a lifetime of the master ; if he do it in early life, he would give all this in about 50 years. If two such women, just twice that sum, of course supposing like product, and so on indefinitely. We have but used the ground assumed by the slaveholding Methodist in his calculations, as we have heard him

make them not merely for the purpose of ridicule, but to show that where the right of property in human beings obtains the whole style of thinking, speaking, and acting, is corrupted, and discloses a total perversion, in these regards, of all heathen notions of justice and of benevolence, not to speak of Christian ethics. Yet grant the right of property in mankind in your church standards, and the claim of benevolence in the above calculation is as valid, it would seem, with the slaveholder, as though 9000 dollars had been thrown into the Missionary Treasury.

This perhaps indicates how Brother Quinn gave "seven thousand dollars" for conscience sake.

EXCUSABLE SIN.—Dr. Quigley, the brother whose stupendous folly was the rival of his stupendous task; who had volunteered to defend the Conference, but who had learned that it declined his services; who came to the rescue of the entire people of two States of our glorious Union, whom his self-constituted attorneyship had made his clients in general, and the different races in particular; white, black, and all shades, together with all characters, from the pious to the profane—ministers, members, and monsters; and who made the attempt to right all their wrongs, sorrows, hardships, and grievances, in an ecclesiastical court, by the prosecution of the author of a book not such as pleased him, perhaps because written against slavery—this unhired champion became the medium of illustrating how our laws against slavery are now administered when the administration is attempted by one heroic as himself in deeds of Herculean labor.

Now no one who knows the Peninsula will deny the statement, that the buying of men, women, and children, without any intention to free them, is a very usual, indeed, almost universal practice among Methodists who buy at all. If the *buying* of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them be any wrong, then we should like it shown that, since 1820, in our Conference, any one was ever before a committee therefor. It used to be that whenever a Methodist bought a slave, he knew that the church required, and demanded his liberty; that if he declined to abide by the judgment of the church, or refused, or neglected to bring the bought slave before the church, that she might break the fetters from his limbs, the buyer would himself be disowned as a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church. But that day has long since passed, and the Methodist now stocks his farm with slaves as he

would with grazing cattle; and it is no offence, and the church never looks after the matter.))

The *sale* of a slave, however, into interminable bondage, was at one time regarded as an offence of the highest grade. We find data for believing this was not allowed under any pretence even to a neighbor, or any other, though a member of the church, until after 1825. It took just about five years, from the time the church ceased to free slaves purchased by her members, to introduce the practice, which afterward came to be considered as no disciplinary offence, that of parting with a slave to a brother or sister Methodist; and about five more to inaugurate the practice of selling a slave to an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or decent sinner, provided he lived contiguously. This done, it required but a few years more to create the license to sell to any of these at a distance, but not to go to the Western Shore; or more than a day's travel from the relatives of the slave. Then it was known in a few years more to be done, provided it was not to a negro trader, and out of the State. The next move was the sale to the negro trader, and to cover it, the plea was urged that the slave had some vice; but a haggling and hypocritical bargain was even then mostly appended, that the slave was not to be sold out of the State. But *now* he is sold to the negro trader to go to any market, sometimes under the plea of being a "bad nigger," and often with no plea whatever of the kind; and the Methodist vendor is very seldom called to account for the offence at all.

We do not understand the rule to be the forbidding of the sale of good slaves merely, and granting the privilege touching the bad; for this might be, if the rule were cared for at all, a sure way of having no good ones according to the testimony of the owner, who might want money more than he wanted slaves. The character of the slave would be just what the master might find it convenient to say it was, and be either good or bad as occasion or the pocket suited. The rule is absolute or it is nothing—a great principle underlies it! It is manifestly this: that we shall recognize no right of property in persons bought; that we shall never attempt to transfer such right to another; to do either is to enslave men, for no purchaser or vendor of man as property and as a slave but is an enslaver of his kind. It was only where this was utterly repudiated, and freedom was the result of such purchase and the intention of the purchaser, that it could occur on the part of the Methodist, as the old records of the Peninsula show. The church, up to 1820, among

us, saw to it in the Quarterly Conferences and by committees appointed therefor, that every one purchasing carried out the implied intention of freedom. The old Methodists regarded the *purchase* of a human being as a slave as *prima facie* evidence of sin in the *relation*, and hence called the person up before the church, or its highest local court. "*His*," the purchaser's "case was considered." Why? He "had purchased a slave or slaves;" the Quarterly Conference ordered their freedom given them; if not agreed to, and promptly performed by the purchaser, no further committee was appointed in the case—the act of purchase with "felonious intent," as lawyers would say, was apparent on the face of the transaction, and the individual was on the spot expelled.

Such was our glorious old anti-slavery Methodism, as we have indubitable evidence from records in our possession, and which perhaps may soon be given the public. Now let us take a glance at the depth of our apostasy.

When the name of T. J. Quigley was called, J. D. Long arose and stated that he objected to the passage of Dr. Quigley's character, not out of any personal hostility to the brother, but upon a conviction of duty. The objection was founded on the administration of Bro. Quigley, and arose out of this well-authenticated occurrence: A member of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the Doctor's charge had sold a slave into bondage for life, and the slave had been carried to the far South; that the act of sale was notorious, and the individual selling was still continued a member of Dr. Quigley's charge; and that he had failed to employ his constitutional power to redress the grievance. To this Dr. Quigley replied by disputing no part of the above statement, but made an avowal that such had been the case, and that the sale had taken place; but said he had called together a committee, who had considered the matter, and reported as their verdict *that the sale was excusable*; that he had fully discharged his duty in the premises, and that he was glad that these brethren of the ultra and fanatical abolition stamp had brought this case before the Conference; that it showed the height and depth, the length and breadth, of the tyrannical measures sought to be forced upon brethren of this Conference by a portion of its own members; that he would never submit to be dictated to as to his duty by such men, and would ask the motives and designs of this procedure. He thought they were apparent to all. In reply, it was stated that the Discipline, when the preacher dissented from the judgment of the committee,

gave Bro. Quigley the right and privilege of carrying the matter to the Quarterly Meeting Conference; that, not having done so in this case, he had not used all his constitutional prerogatives for the redress of an outrage on the church. The speaker had got thus far, and was proceeding with this sentence, "We disclaim any intention of going beyond the Discipline in this case—" when Bishop Ames started to his feet, and said, holding the Discipline in his hand, "The Discipline makes the matter of a reference entirely optional with the preacher; it is only when he sees proper to do it, that it is to be done; the law of the Discipline is not absolute, as making it *duty*—he may or may not do it, as his judgment may dictate;" and that "a few brethren ought not to appear here as the censors of the Conference and of the brethren whose administration did not happen to suit them;" with other remarks of the same character, equally kind and superintendent-like, while professedly occupying the chair of the Conference. Upon his interrupting the speaker as above noted, we remained standing for a moment or two, until we observed that the *Bishop had taken the floor* on the question; and when the word "censors," in the connection above given, fell from his mouth, we resumed our seat, having yielded the floor only because it was taken from us upon no call or question from any member of the body that we were out of order, and without opportunity of replying to the charges and epithets so freely bestowed by Dr. Quigley. When the Bishop had concluded his remarks, which were certainly very unexpected to us from the conviction which we entertained in regard to the duty of the preacher in such a case, he told Dr. Quigley he might retire; when the vote was put, and the Doctor's character passed—the writer voting against its passage. This circumstance of voting against the passage of the character of Dr. Quigley was particularly observed, it would seem, by Bishop Ames, who—on a subsequent day of the Conference, upon a disclaimer put in when replying to Dr. Quigley's charge that Bro. Long and myself had made an assault upon his character—said: "You voted against the passage of his character, didn't you?" To which we replied we had, and that upon administrative grounds; and that if this was an "assault" upon character, we could not help it, as we voted our own conviction in the case. No brother, a member of the Conference, but will bear the writer witness that neither Bro. Cunningham, Long, myself, nor any other of the anti-slavery members of the body, attacked the motives either of an individual, or of the majority; or, during any time, failed in courtesy

to them, or to any member of the Conference, by calling an unbrotherly name during the entire session of the Conference. We did not hear the word "pro-slavery" or any other term of the kind applied to the majority, or to any one brother, on that side, though "fanatical," "ultra abolition," etc., were freely applied by them to us; and in one instance, as a few of us sat together or near each other, we were pointed out derisively to the large congregation, with the finger, during the speech of a member on the other side. In fact, it became such an habitual matter, that even our good Bishop fell into the same current of speech, so strong was it, and called us the "censors of the Conference." The only exception to the above statement was the little episode of Dr. Hodgson and Bro. Long; but this was after a direct personality and naming of Bro. Long by the Doctor, when the words "cotton Doctor" escaped him.

Having given the history of the case, and the incidents connected with it, let us look at this matter as affording light on the question of the administration of our laws, where in any case it may be attempted—a thing very unusual, as is well known. Most of our ministers permit matters of this kind to pass without any administration whatever. It was for the purpose of disclosing this point, *the kind of administration had*, that the matter was brought to the attention of the Conference, and of having the Conference take the responsibility of disapproving in some way such shabby, and farcical, yet highly criminal cases of administration.

What did the Conference do? How did the Conference act in this matter? Not merely did they pass it over as unworthy their regard, but the parties who thought it might afford an opportunity to get up our miserable mal-administration were soundly reprehended and reprobated by the chair, who, supported by a majority sympathizing with him in the work, became the willing agent to do for them unasked, what they did not thus need to do themselves. The very course too was pursued to which we were shut up, by the teachings and rulings of the Bishop—by his unprecedented decision that anything brought before the Conference on the passage of character requiring explanation or information in regard to a brother must be brought in formal charges: and that no inquiries which could implicate either administration or slaveholding, should be had otherwise. The Bishop in this case decided that there was no ground either for objection or charges. Thus, as is seen, for doing the only thing we could do, in the nature of the case, he was the official reprover; and thus set an example for the Conference by vote to do what was after-

ward done, but much more leniently and kindly, in the resolutions of Dr. Anderson and Bro. T. C. Murphy.

HOW IT LOOKS TO US.—Let us look at the finding of the committee appointed by Dr. Quigley. The first thing that arrests attention is the character of the finding itself. It was, as we had it from the lips of the Dr.: “That the act of sale was excusable.” Now let the following facts be taken into the account: The negro woman was sold into perpetual slavery, and sold out of the State, as we have learned from a variety of authentic sources. Yet the sale of a human being into perpetual slavery, and out of the State, to go into the hands of any kind of master, whether a Legree or a better man, is adjudged excusable, and Dr. Quigley has done his duty, satisfied his conscience, and, as an administrator of our church’s Discipline, has maintained the church’s honor and purity in the case; though the member passes even without the slightest reproof, and is continued, we suppose, as an example to guide others in excusable negro-trading in the Church of God.

One cannot well imagine how the committee in this case could stultify itself so far as to agree to such a finding. We suppose the charge against the offending person could not be of a less grade than *immorality*—the specification, *for selling a slave*. In our judgment this is a crime of the highest grade, expressly forbidden in the Word of God, and sufficient to exclude the offending party from the kingdom of grace and glory. The apostle enumerates this character, thus guilty, as among the greatest criminals. For the truth of these statements, let us quote from Dr. Elliott’s “Bible and Slavery,” published by our Methodist Book Concern. The author, it may be remarked, has never, in any portion of our church, passed for an ultra, or fanatical abolitionist; but, on the contrary, for a “conservatist” of the first water. He says: “Many good men have bought a slave for the purpose of restoring to freedom; but would not for the world sell a slave into bondage to another. Slaveholders who do this are called by St. Paul—1 Timothy i. 9, 10—*man-stealers*, or the *stealers*, VENDORS, or *holders* of men, as slaves; and that *man-stealer*, or slave-dealer, or possessor of the property—except a *possessor in trust*—is synonymous with *thief*, is plain from Exodus xxi. 16, where the *thief*, the VENDOR, or holder of a stolen man, is equally guilty, and to be punished with death.”

If it be asked who are *thieves*, we find the following: “While men hold slaves as property [the selling as property implies assuredly the

holding as property in this case], except in *trust*, in order to restore it [to the owner, and according to our author every man owns himself], no other terms will so well designate them as *manstealer*, *thief*, *slaveholder*, *slavedealer*; and such are the very words which the Holy Ghost employs both in the Old and New Testaments: ‘And they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites.’ Gen. xxxvii. 28. ‘For indeed I was *stolen* away out of the land of the Hebrews.’ Gen. xl. 15. These passages also show that he who *sells* or *buys* one man from a third person, except to ransom him, is called a *thief*.”—Pp. 76, 77. Of Joseph’s sale he further says, p. 79: “Here is a case described at length of the forcible seizure, or kidnapping, of one person by others; of his sale as an article of merchandise for money, and a subsequent sale of him as property to another; *and all exactly as our slave seizures, and sales, and purchases are now made*. The transaction is *theft*, and a *sin, worthy of death by the law of God*.” Recurring again to the specific crime of selling, our author says, in his remarks on 1 Tim. i. 9, 10: The *andropodistes* [manstealers] “embrace all who make merchandise of men in any sense except to free them.”—Pp. 316, 317, 318, 320. “Manstealers, the worst of all *thieves*, in comparison with whom highwaymen and house-breakers are innocent.”—(*Wesley*.)

For the correctness of these views—and they claim to have the authority of the Apostle who classes with whoremongers and murderers, as is seen, the person who sells a slave—our readers may judge for themselves. The correctness of those opinions will not, with an unprejudiced mind, be matter of skepticism. We have quoted from this late work of Dr. Elliott, not because other and indeed numberless other authorities might not be cited, showing what a high grade of offence is the selling of a human being; but because it bears the *imprimatur* of our own Book Concern, while its views are in consonance with all the great writers of our church on this point, and with those of our distinguished founder.

The General Rule is absolute. “The buying or selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them,” is expressly forbidden by the constitution of the church; yet a committee say that though this law was violated, the violation is excusable.

No circumstances can excuse so foul, so heinous an offence! None can be imagined which can justify or excuse this terrible deed of shame. As well might one talk of excusable larceny, or robbery, or burglary, or adultery, or incest, or murder, as of the excusable selling of a blood-redeemed human being into interminable bondage

by a professed disciple of Jesus. The church which, under any circumstances, would consent to regard such an act as not a disciplinary offence, "a crime expressly forbidden in the word of God," would be unworthy the confidence of a semi-savage; it deserves to go down loaded with the curses and scorn of the universe. And the Methodist preacher who would stop this side of the last constitutional resort to protect the character and honor of the church in such a case—what shall we say of him? With the writer, no language perhaps would be more decorous, while imposing a degree of restraint, than the words of rebuke which fell from the pen of D. D. Whedon, D.D., in regard to Dr. Quigley, who said, for other action than this: "For myself, not for all the worlds that roll in immensity, would I go to the judgment seat of Christ occupying the position of Dr. Quigley."

Is that General Rule a rule forbidding sin? or is it dependent on circumstances, or the question of character in the person sold? It might indeed have occurred to Dr. Quigley that the finding of the committee itself was the equivalent of the verdict of guilty. This is apparent to every mind on the face of the business. But the offender is *excusably* guilty of an infraction of the laws of God, and of the Church of God, in a case where, under the direct legislation of Heaven, the offender was to die!

The Dr., it would seem, acquiesced in the judgment of the committee, and the debauched sentiment of the slaveholding, perhaps slavedealing, members of that committee found a fellow-criminal guiltless of crime; while a pliant representative of the Great Shepherd of souls, by apparent collusion and complicity with what the Bible denounces as manstealing and robbery, permits the case to stand, thus showing how, even in the unusual cases when administration is had at all, all the ends of justice and the discipline may be perverted, and the Church of Jesus, bought by his agony on the cross, be crimsoned in the sin of blood-guiltiness unspeakable. While sleepless and Eternal Justice mutters at the guilty altar, and should mutter in the guilty conscience,

"Hoarse, horrible, and strong,
Raising to Heaven that blood-avenging cry,
Filling the arches of the hollow sky,
How long—O God, how long?"

Whether the sale was made to obtain means for liberal expenditure on selfish gratification, for the purpose of throwing generously

into the hands of the stewards for the support of Dr. Quigley; or for the purpose of contributing largely to our missionary fund for the conversion of more literal cannibals; or whether to cover the sale by a Methodist, some mad-dog cry of thief was raised against the poor sold one, we are not prepared to say. Supposing that she may have been restive under slavery, or pilfered when hunger impelled thereto, or a thief who stole in return from those who stole her liberty and womanhood, and left her in brutal ignorance, or took from her a husband, perhaps too her children; who had made her a slave, and kept her a slave, and doomed her to perpetual slavery—suppose all this were true of her character, what then? Shall she be thus punished for doing in a small way, what all her life has been done to her on the largest scale? For following in an humble degree the *Christian* example of wholesale robbery and plunder set her by her godly master or mistress? Just Heaven! Thou who “art no respecter of persons,” if those who profess to follow the example of thy Son are thus illustrating his benevolence!—if to sell into returnless exile one of thy redeemed ones, of that sex toward which, with thy rudest lessons on their heart, even savages regard with a kinder interest, be an excusable offence in thy church, what lesson of right, of truth, or of mercy can it teach mankind!

What a monstrous perversion is this almost blasphemous proslavery Christianity! Read the following as illustrating its spirit, and yet having the benevolent feature:—

“Mr. Charles Bodmann, of Cincinnati, had, among other property, three female slaves left him by a deceased relative in Baltimore. He took the slaves from Baltimore to Lexington, and there sold them to a slave trader. Being taken to task for it by a Cincinnati paper, he says, by way of explanation: I brought the girls away from Baltimore, and caused ‘them to be sold in Kentucky, intending at the time, as I still do, to appropriate the proceeds of sale to benevolent purposes.’ Doubtless the next we shall hear of the *benevolent* Mr. Charles Bodmann will be that he has turned highwayman and gone to throat-cutting to raise money for benevolent purposes. Could any person but an out-and-out lunatic hope to justify such an act by such a plea?”—*Milwaukee Free Democrat*.

But to feel uneasy at such a deed in a church member—to object to the administration of a brother for failing to use all his constitutional power to protect the church, and deter others from a like crime by showing that only after the last court of the church had been in vain appealed to for redress would such a flagrant injustice be allowed, is to be “fanatical” and a “censor!” Let ill names be

called! We send on our appeal to the *Last Judgment*—we are willing, too, to let it rest with our readers; we must obey conscience.

"On Saturday afternoon of the Conference two scenes occurred which illustrate at least the differences of opinion that exist in regard to the moral estimate put on the same localities. After the character of Rev. John Allen, from the southern part of the Peninsula—perhaps from the Eastern Shore of Virginia—was passed, he asked permission to make a statement in regard to his connection with slavery. The reverend gentleman stated that he had in his family a manumitted slave, who was to be free at the age of 22 or 23 years, and that he did not consider himself a slaveholder. The gentleman then pronounced a high panegyric on the South generally, and the lower portion of the Peninsula particularly. He called it 'Paradise,' 'the land of Beulah,' and his feelings seemed to carry him away into a state of delightful complacency, as well in regard to himself as the object of his idolatry. He gave it great praise, and even spoke with raptures of 'its institutions.' A few moments after, when the name of Rev. Handy Long, a colored local preacher of Newtown, Md., was called, Rev. J. M. McCarter arose after the hearing of the case, as represented by Mr. Colclazer, and remarked that he felt some interest in the case before the body, for the reason that he had the same surname as his friend (pointing to Rev. J. D. Long); he hoped and believed that he was deserving of all the good that had been said of him; that he would cheerfully vote for him to be elected to orders; he was sincerely desirous that he should be put on his guard against his having a copy of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' in his possession.

"Interrupted by Rev. P. Coombe, who, appealing to the Chair, wished to know 'if the brother was in order; that he would like to know what Uncle Tom's Cabin had to do with the case now before us?'

"Mr. McCarter continued—'I was remarking that some good friend should inform this local preacher, about to be elected to orders, to be sure not to have a copy of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' in his possession, as a brother of his color, an acceptable member and exhorter of the Methodist Episcopal Church, named Samuel Green, was now in the Maryland Penitentiary—sentenced thereto for ten years—for the grave offence of having a single volume of that offensive and incendiary publication in his house. The Dorchester County Court had last spring passed the sentence, and to-day, he, while we are here, is incarcerated to remain for ten long years, for no moral offence.

"Some of the ministers present hissed as Mr. McCarter passed to his seat, saying, 'So much for Paradise' and 'the land of Beulah!' and 'Southern institutions.'

"But I suppose (ironically) there are spots in the sun.'

"A preacher exclaimed, 'I consider that speech an insult to this body.' Perhaps others besides him so considered it. He regarded the matter only as a reminder of the words, 'Remember those that are in bonds as bound with them.'"—*Phil. Ev. Bulletin*.

But if this reminder was an insult, what an outrage it would have been to have offered, as perhaps we ought to have done, and for signatures in the open Conference, the following:—

"PETITION TO HIS EXCELLENCY, GOVERNOR H. HICKS, OF MARYLAND.—
Whereas, it has come to the knowledge of this Conference of Christian

ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that during the past year an official member of the said church, named Samuel Green, within the bounds of this Conference, has been sentenced to ten years in the Maryland State Prison; *And whereas*, the aforesaid official member, a colored man, being still in good standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, is now in the penitentiary of the aforesaid State; therefore,

Resolved, That this body most respectfully and earnestly ask the attention of the Governor of Maryland to his case, and petition his Excellency to interpose his executive clemency in his behalf. And we will ever pray, &c."

We had a long conversation with the pastor of Samuel Green at the Conference, and learned that his name was still continued on the Quarterly Conference Record of the Circuit as a regularly licensed exhorter in the church. The excellence of the character of the incarcerated man is attested everywhere in Dorchester County, where he was known, and those among whom he lived. He was exceedingly useful, also, among the colored free people and slaves, and often in their meeting-houses preached to them the word of life.

Dr. Quigley, during the morning session of the fourth day, rose to a question of privilege, and replied to all he could remember of what had been said against him in that "respectable paper," "Zion's Herald," Boston. He referred also to some other papers, which he seemed to think not quite so respectable, and what had been said of him in them by editors and anonymous writers, replying to members of the Conference who had written about him, but concluded by assuring the body that all these were unworthy of his prowess. To do anything in the way of meeting them, he said, would resemble "Ocean into tempest tost, to waft a feather or to drown a fly!" But before he sat down he spoke sharply of those who had, during the session of the Conference, made an "assault" upon his character.

Brother Long said that, as to himself, he always wrote under his own signature, and held himself responsible to Dr. Quigley, or any one else, for what he wrote. Upon Brother Long's making the remark that he believed he was the only one who could be referred to as, in "Zion's Herald," appearing against Dr. Quigley under his own name, the Bishop, interrupting Brother Long, said: "Oh! yes there was; he had read in that paper, since the Conference, an article of the kind, the production of another," referring doubtless to an article of the writer's in the issue of the 24th of March. Upon my attempt to speak in reply, a number started to their feet, and endeavored to prevent my being heard, when the Bishop was good enough to say: "Let the brother unburthen himself," or "his mind." Another voice: "Yes, let him make an apology." I then stated that I had

no apology to make, and, after a few words, resumed my seat, saying, as I did so, that I had not committed an assault on Dr. Quigley's character; when Bishop Ames said: "You voted against the passage of his character; didn't you?" It was thus the *generous* majority of the Conference acted their part in these our attempts to get a hearing, though no anti-slavery man in the body made a speech during the Conference occupying the time allotted to each speaker, *i. e.* fifteen minutes, while Dr. Cooper and Dr. Quigley filled up the full measure of theirs more than once.

The cause of the slave shall yet be heard in the Philadelphia Conference; the defying period—that period which precedes overthrow, as the history of every great movement shows—is now upon the Philadelphia Conference, and a local majority on this question in this Conference may be defiant and intolerant; but the time is short.

Many of the members of this Conference are tied by their antecedents; and as some of the leading men of the Conference voted with the Church South in 1844, we may infer what was their *status* then, and, as we know of no word or action since contradicting that vote, we suppose years have brought no change.

One cannot but feel surprise that the spirit of slavery should so influence, even those who boast of their conservatism, as to make them the opponents of the vital and increasing moral sentiment which seeks the destruction of slavery in the church.

We have lived all our life where pro-slavery opinions and measures were popular. We have served the church as an itinerant in a conference much of whose territory lies in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and whose boast has been her conservatism. We think that, insensibly to themselves, many of our leading ministers, from the habit of apologizing for its existence in the church, from their relations to slave-holding families into which they have married, as well as from the high estimate they have formed of the personal character of some of our slave-holding brethren, have been unconsciously drawn into an offensive attitude toward those views which are at war with the continuance of slave-holding in the church. Nothing has surprised us more than to find that these good men, when their nearly uninterrupted repose has been disturbed by some one, persist in unkind and injurious treatment of the ministers who but hold the views of Wesley and Asbury, and of the Discipline "as it was," when its ban was upon the slaveholder. Intellectual acumen, pure mo-

tives, and veracity have been denied them, while private character and even the sacred precincts and privacies of the family have been invaded to furnish fuel for the funeral pyre upon which their reputation was to be sacrificed. Then there are others in the Conference "conservatists," who fly to the Book of God for arguments to prove that slavery is not sinful, throwing themselves off the platform of our present Discipline, and acting toward all notions of advance, and the persons representing them, as though in each opinion they beheld soul-destroying heresy, and in each representative of it one unworthy the amenities of Christian and social life.

We have asked ourselves, Why is this? Are slavery and slave-holding in the church more sacred than everything else in her bosom? Is it to her the pearl of greatest price, her highest ornament, nay, *her very life*? Lay delegation, and the Presiding Eldership question may be discussed! Against, or in favor of either of these, men may take a stand openly and avowedly; but not against slavery in the church.

We are gravely told at times by these good men, who profess sincerely to desire the prosperity of the church, of the danger of agitation upon the subject of slavery in the church: "that agitation will engender schism, and provoke separation, and lose us our territory, and dismember the church," splitting it into fragments, we suppose, so small that the Devil, taking them up successively, and managing to carry them, will throw the several broken pieces into the very much-to-be-dreaded sea of oblivion. Now, much of this statement is bad theology and worse common sense. Separation, schism, loss of territory, loss of property are very bad things. But there are worse things, worse than even these. Loss of character is worse; loss of purity is worse; loss of the favor of God, in a word, is worst of all, while it is but a consequent upon loss of character and purity. The church's purity is more than suspected, because of our present relations to slavery. Our character will witness sad declination in the eyes of the world, and our boasted *prestige* wane with the increasing light and conviction thrown upon the public mind everywhere above the border, in regard to the character of our slave-holding, and the want of administration of our church laws relating to the travelling ministry, and official members. We think that, looking upon the question even in the light of expediency, the time is come for our church to have done with this abomination; no longer to hug it to her bosom, but to detach it thence as an evil; no longer to throw over it the

mantle of extenuating pleas, but to get rid of it as not less a duty we owe God and humanity than to the times and their necessities and demands upon us.

These extenuating pleas and pleadings for its continuance to sanctified character, should be put away, and slave-holding should be made an offence against the church's Discipline. For our share, we shall believe in the anti-slavery character of the church, just as soon as the slave finds it out, or finds out that his master is not protected and indorsed in his sin by the church, and until then we shall remain skeptical.

This is the true stand point after all ! To this all philosophy, all expediency, all measures and men may be brought as the indubitable test alike set forth in the teachings of Jesus and the very nature of the case. The slave, not the master ! The slave, not the dollars, nor the territory, nor any other thing apart from him. To him, imbruted, down-trodden, scourged, chattelized as a neighbor fallen among thieves, as a brother redeemed by the blood of a common Christ and Saviour—to him, and by him, and for him, the church is to bring her measures to be tested ; for in him, degraded as you behold him, is a value beyond earthly organizations and temporal economies and expediencies ; and around the chained and plundered slave more interests centre, immortal and eternal, than around any or all those things by which his cries are made to be disregarded, that shut him out from sight or blot him from the list of considerations by which church action should be regulated. How long before the church shall learn the import of that saying of Christ, “Go thou and learn what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice.” Let us remember who it was that taught that *man* was more than the sabbath, than earth, sea, skies, or the animated existences below him throughout all nature. Yet is this priceless immortal in the person of the slave, tasked, bled from, bought, sold, and brutalized, and all with permission of a conference of ministers of a professed Church of Christ. Just in so far as she allows it she has no right to call herself by His name who bled for the slave ; just in so far, we fear, she has at least one characteristic of “the synagogue of Satan.” While her members are tolerated in trading in the souls and bodies of men, or even enslaving them, we fear she, to this extent, and in this respect, bears the Apocalyptic brand of the Mother of Harlots upon her brow and in the full literalness of the language. But let us never forget that it requires but this one thing to be removed to render her

a fair daughter of that "Jerusalem which is from above, and which is the mother of us all." Would God that this one work were accomplished!

"Better save souls, and let slavery alone," said a Presiding Elder to us, when told that we contemplated getting up this pamphlet. Save *souls*! Soul saving is a great business, but no minister of Jesus has this work to do in the sense in which some persons would have it understood. With them "souls" are very precious, figurative, and phantasmal things, but not what the old translators of the Bible called *souls*. They meant the human beings of whom they spoke, but not the metaphysical abstractions of which some men would go in search in ghostly places, and by ghostly and talismanic charms save them. All the "souls" with whom a minister has to do, as to their saving, happen to be associated with bodies. On some other theatre, when flesh is left behind, one might find employment for ministers who want to save these metaphysical souls; but we have no use for them in this present except to illustrate the ridiculous. "Fishers of *men*," "saving *men*," these are the words, and to do it a something is to be presented recognizing man and addressed to man as man, and which has a peculiar interest in his welfare and development for time; these are characteristics essential to any system pretending to claim a man's faith, or a divine origin.

A religion which would give prayers, but no bread to the starving; which would stop at good wishes; which says: "Be ye warmed, be ye fed, be ye clothed," but expends itself in these—I care not what *you* call it, it is not "the love of God," and the thing is a vicious and beggarly counterfeit of the genuine, according to God's teaching.

'Tis time we had done with that *inhuman* religion which prays to God and robs men; which gives to the missionary treasury, and plunders cradles; which stands by its representative on the pulpit, but really stands *on* down-trodden men; which is clamorous about saving souls, while it is damning their manhood, and womanhood, and childhood, and all the relationships of these throughout all time. Any decent infidelity is better than such a barbarous religion as this. 'Tis well nigh blasphemy to call it Christianity. Though some people call it Methodism, they but slander Methodism by such claim, and ruin it by such diabolical practices. But if men are to be saved, their religion has something to do with the business of this saving. "*Salt* is good, but if the salt has lost its savor, 'tis good"—not for

saving, but for the dunghill. To the dunghill with pro-slavery salt! Amen!

Every division and style of men in the body, save the abolitionists, seeks and appropriates the title of "conservatist." Under this term, and claiming its protectorate, are found two leading classes. Those who are quietists, and those who are pro-slavery. The chief characteristic of the former, in contradistinction from the latter, as we have thought, is their mortal fear of all agitation. It would seem that their understanding of conservatism was the frozen winter, its fitting representative, the silence and chill of an arctic one at that; or, if growth and progress be allowed, it is the growth of an iceberg by frozen accretion. The more usual employment of this class consists in the liberal use of the vulgar and bugbear expletives which have been manufactured by the other class, sailing under the same general distinctive appellation, together with an appropriation to themselves of the office of seer in Lochiel's Warning, and like a parrot kept by a gardener, whose whole vocabulary had been confined to one word by the owner of inviting fruits, to be used for frightening school-boys who might be tempted to indulge in a luscious peach, so these are uttering the seer's and parrot's "Beware! Beware! Beware! Beware!" Its incessant repetition by the parrot of our school-boy recollections grew into a thing of course, and without further power to terrify than if he had spared his pestilent throat.

On the heights of the forest-crowned hills of the State of Maine, a friend of ours once followed the business of lumbering. When the magnificent trunks of those noble trees, by the woodman's axe and cross-cut saw, had been prepared and loaded, the wagon, with the tons of weight upon it which a single log gave, was started down the hill with one pair of oxen to manage the tongue and guide it, while sometimes three, four, and sometimes five pairs, coupled in the rear of each other and of the wagon by great chains and breechings, did the holding back, until the base of the great hill was reached. His observation of his teams led him to say that those accustomed to the rear work and the breechings soon grew good for nothing else, and that, accustomed to pull back, he had more than once, on a perfect level, and their places changed to the front, seen them, at the words "Gee up!" throw up their heads and violently throw themselves back on their haunches, sometimes fairly landing on their rear in the road, and when whipped up to their feet again, would, at the words "Gee up!" repeat the caper, or stand in their tracks, their

legs prop-wise, shake their wise heads and bellow with affright at the novelty of their position. For draught oxen, on the reverse, none were better, said our friend; "but from managing such oxen at the front of the wagon, patience deliver me! They were only literally in the road, and worse than good for nothing." These "conservatists," in our Conference, are thus illustrated. They are, to say the most for them, men who are willing to tolerate a sure evil for a contingent good, and who hold back notably.

But will not the church divide if those measures succeed which are urged—measures making the holding of slaves an offence? Will not our slaveholding territory withdraw from us in the event of an alteration of the disciplinary code in respect to slavery?

Before answering, let us ask a few questions in return. Are you willing that our present laws shall remain a dead letter? Does any one now believe that the discipline is faithfully administered touching slavery in our slaveholding territory? If so, we do not envy his knowledge, while we pity his credulity. The latter is indeed his salient virtue. "But some preachers on the border deny the statements made in regard to want of administration." Well, suppose they do? Our people are more honest who are slaveholders, and tell you frankly not only that they are not administered, but should not be. Some of our preachers say they cannot attempt the administration of discipline, and remain on the circuits as acceptable preachers. Most of the ministers laboring there acknowledge that in all places the administration is very imperfect, while we know that in much of the territory cursed with slavery none is attempted. But you will observe one thing—it is this: that no man has risked his reputation for truth before the public by affirming during the last year in any one of our organs or Conferences that the discipline of the church is faithfully administered. It was not asserted even by Dr. Quigley at our Conference; and we doubt whether the most pro-slavery preacher among us, whose personal knowledge and observation are his guarantees of arriving at the truth, can be found, who, in the light of day, at home, with the men and facts on hand to confront him, would publicly assert this as true. We twice within the present year asserted the reverse of this in the "Christian Advocate and Journal," and no man, under his own name, or even under the shelter of an assumed one, contradicted our statement. It then will be seen that these denials of the truth of statements made by abolitionists and others in public print, and in Conferences, are mere

sophistical quibbles upon the words in which those statements are made, or consist of particular facts where the contrary has been known in a given instance, and by which general delinquency is sought to be palliated.

The following characteristic episode occurred during the last day of the session of the Conference:—

Dr. I. T. Cooper, finding, much to his chagrin, that the Conference refused to put Mr. Long and his book into the hands of a committee, according to a motion offered by him at a previous day of the Conference—a committee who were to have a whole year to get up the material for a private trial and condemnation, or a public one at the next annual Conference, and we suppose for the purpose of showing to the vast audience present, that some one was magnanimous enough to intimate an answer to Mr. Long—or to gain a growth of favor from the majority by an exhibition of prowess on the pro-slavery side—asked permission to take extracts from the journal of the Conference and *carte blanche* for their use, should he see it necessary to reply during the year to Mr. Long's book by a counter publication. This was granted. The writer then asked the Conference for the like privilege in reference to so much of the action of the Conference as related to the case of Rev. Wm. Quinn, which was, by vote of the Conference, denied him. This, we say, was a characteristic affair, affording stupendous demonstration that the journals of the Conference could only be had for use on one side of the question of slavery.

The vote of denial of the request made by us had its effect upon many in the audience, and showed clearly to many of the younger members of the Conference, who afterwards spoke of its injustice, that the records of the Conference by the majority were consecrated, as themselves were, to the defence and continuance of slavery in the church of God. It was only, however, an act consistent in character with all the precedents of the majority, seeking to shut out the light of day from all the ministerial, official, and church abominations in regard to slavery, among us. It is well thus to act—the part is wise—for only by assiduous blanketing and disguises and frauds upon northern Methodist opinion, which would be a unit on the subject of detaching it from the church were its true character known, it is that its perpetuation can be counted on at all. The day which witnesses the Alpha of its life record read by the people, will witness the Omega of its doom written in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

CHAPTER III.

CHARACTER OF SLAVEHOLDING AMONG OFFICIAL AND PRIVATE MEMBERS.—The character of the slaveholding in the Philadelphia Annual Conference, among members of the church, is a matter we suppose pretty well understood by all who have read "Pictures of Slavery." The best illustration it gives of itself—one which leaves no room for scepticism—is found in the following significant clippings. This is our second specimen of illustrated literature:—



\$2,000 REWARD. Ran away from the subscriber, on Saturday night, 24th inst., fourteen head of negroes, viz.: 4 men, 2 women, one boy, and seven children. Kit is about 35 years of age, 5 feet 6 or 7 inches high. Joe is about 30 years old, very black, his teeth are very white, and is about 5 feet 8 inches high. Henry is about 22 years old, of dark chestnut color, and large front teeth. Joe is about 20 years old, heavy built and black. Tom is about 16 years old, light chestnut color. Susan is about 35 years old, dark chestnut color, and rather stout built, speaks rather slow, and has with her 4 children, varying from 1 to 7 years old. Leah is about 28 years old, about 5 feet high, dark chestnut color, with 3 children, 2 boys and 1 girl, from 1 to 8 years old. I will give \$1000 if taken in the county, \$1500 if taken out of the county and in the State, and \$2000 if taken out of the State; in either case to be lodged in Cambridge jail, so that I can get them again; or I will give a fair proportion of the above reward if any part are secured.

Oct. 26th, 1857.

SAMUEL PATTISON,
Near Cambridge, Md.

P. S.—Since writing the above, I have discovered that my negro woman Sarah Jane, 25 years old, stout built, and chestnut color, has also run off.

S. P.

Cambridge (Md.) Democrat, Nov. 24, 1857.

Of this steward, Rev. J. D. Long says, in "Zion's Herald:"—

"We must not sin that good may come out of it. If the church regarded slaveholding as sinful in the same sense that she regards drunkenness as sinful, hundreds of our members would immediately let the oppressed go free. But alas! for us, the church for thirty years in Maryland has lost her conscience and testimony against slavery. I have listened time and again to instructions to young preachers, given at or before ordination by our venerable bishops, but never heard one insinuate that it was a preacher's duty to instruct masters to liberate their slaves. Dead and profound silence has been practised with regard to slavery. Hence our members have grown up under the impression that men and women, made of the same blood as themselves, are their property in the same sense that a horse or a cow is. Hence advertisements like the above frequently appear in the county papers, signed by members of the M. E. Church. Mr. Pattison is a member of high standing in the M. E. Church in Dorchester County, Md. I know Mr. Pattison personally, and I have no doubt that he feeds and clothes his slaves as well as any other slaveholder in or out of the church. I give his own advertisement, as it appeared in the Cambridge Democrat (Md.), of Nov. 4th, 1857."

"The above speaks for itself. Kidnappers, negro-hunters, arrests, chains, jail, cruel separations for life. For had they been captured, if Mr. Pattison had not sold them to the negro traders, according to a late law in Maryland, the State would have done it. Mr. Pattison has had a wrong moral and religious training with regard to slavery; and we, preachers of the Philadelphia Conference, have aided in giving him that training, and the General Conference of the M. E. Church has aided the Philadelphia Conference, especially since 1836."

Rev. J. D. Long, in the "Northern Independent," says:—

"The following notice appeared in the 'Cambridge Democrat,' of Jan. 6th, 1858, headed, 'Runaway Negroes taken. The seven negroes that run off on the night of

the 31st of December—the *property* of *Dr. Phelps* and James E. Hall—were brought back, and lodged in the jail of the county, on last *Sunday* morning. They were captured in Caroline County, about four miles above Denton, by Mr. Satterfield, who will pocket, and certainly deserves the \$1000 reward offered for their arrest.' Dr. Phelps is a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is reputed to be wealthy, and is a distinguished and influential man in the political circles of Maryland. Think of it, ye Northern pro-slavery Methodists, that seek to excuse and apologize for Methodist Episcopal slaveholding on the Border—that on the holy Sabbath morning, seven human beings, made in the image of our Heavenly Father, were marched into jail, hand-cuffed, for the crime of trying to be freemen; and, for all I know to the contrary, Dr. Phelps may have attended the M. E. Church the same day, and helped sing the following beautiful stanzas:—

“ Jesus, the name that charms our fears,
That bids our sorrows cease,
'Tis music in the sinner's ear,
'Tis life, and health, and peace.

“ He breaks the power of cancelled sin,
He sets the *prisoner free*—
His blood can make the foulest clean,
His blood avails for me.”

Besides these, we have seen the same kind of advertisements from various other members, stewards, and exhorters in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and which are not given because our space forbids it. We have, however, the following, accompanied by a letter, which gives our readers a good idea of the notions obtaining in regard to slavery among the very best class of our slaveholders. The gentleman whose name is to it is a wealthy local preacher in our church on Taylor's Island, Dorchester County, Md. It is from the “Cambridge Democrat,” and is as follows:—



\$300 REWARD. Ran away from the subscriber, from the neighborhood of Town Point, on Saturday night, 24th inst., my negro man, Aaron Cornish, about 35 years old. He is about 5 feet 10 inches high, black, good looking, rather pleasant countenance, and carries himself with a confident manner. He went off with his wife Daffney, a negro woman belonging to Reuben E. Philips. I will give the above reward if taken out of the county, and \$200 if taken in the county; in either case, to be lodged in Cambridge (Md.) jail.

Oct. 28, 1857.

LEVI D. TRAVERS.

We copy the following from the “Cambridge (Md.) Eagle,” March 10th, 1858:—

MR. EDITOR: The inclosed communication was sent to the Editor of the “Philadelphia Evening Journal,” for publication. He refusing to give it a place in the columns of his paper unless paid the enormous sum of \$45, it has been returned to me by a friend, to whose care it was committed. It was intended as a defence of myself and the slaveholders of the M. E. Church, against the attack of the Rev. John D. Long, West Philadelphia, made through the columns of a Philadelphia paper, and extensively copied by the abolition papers of the North. I was desirous of replying to this modern abolitionist through a paper published in the city where he is resident; that privilege being denied me under the general usage by an editor of a northern paper, who asked to be bought by money to open his columns to a correspondent, even for the vindication of his personal character, I herewith send my reply for publication in your widely circulated paper, congratulating myself that the Southern press is not only willing but able to defend Southern rights and Southern honor.

Yours, LEVI D. TRAVERS.

TAYLOR'S ISLAND, MD.

To the Editor of the Philadelphia Evening Journal.

A few days ago I received a letter, of which the following is a copy:—

MUNCIE, Jan. 13, 1858.

LEVI D. TRAVERS.—SIR: The following \$300 reward, and the sentiments accompanying it, are respectfully submitted to your careful and prayerful consideration.

S. W. HARLAN.

With the writer of the above I have no personal acquaintance. Whatever may have been his motives in writing to me, I feel indebted to him for the information communicated. The reward referred to is a copy of an advertisement from the "Cambridge (Md.) Democrat," in which \$300 is offered for the apprehension of a negro slave, and his delivery in Cambridge jail, signed Levi D. Travers. The *sentiments* which my correspondent from Indiana submits to my careful and prayerful consideration, was clipped, with the reward, from some paper of the Northern (abolition) press, where doubtless it has had an extensive circulation, and purports to be a production from the pen of John Dixon Long, West Philadelphia. I have no personal acquaintance with this gentleman, yet I know him by character. He is a minister of the M. E. Church, and holds a supernumerary relation with her Philadelphia Conference. He has very recently become the author of a book called the "Pictures of Slavery," in which he represents and misrepresents the condition of slavery within the bounds of the Philadelphia Conference (in and out of the church), particularly in the southern territory of the said Conference, and for those misrepresentations charges have already been preferred against him. At the next session of the Philadelphia Conference, his conduct will be investigated, and we shall then know whether that dignified and conservative* body will indorse the principles, and approve of the conduct, of this fanatical supernumerary of their body, who, not physically able to go forth and proclaim to the slaves of sin and hell liberty to their captive souls, is actively engaged in thundering his anathemas upon all slave-holders, calling them atheists and man-stealers, and thus engendering a bitter spirit of fanaticism in the minds of our Northern brethren against us who live in the slave territory of the M. E. Church, and are slave-holders, or whether they will prescribe the conduct of this disturber of the peace of a border conference, so inconsistent with, and contrary to, their line of policy.† Holding as they do conservative views upon the great and perplexing question of slavery, we are of opinion, sir, that they will either chain this Lion of Slavery agitation in the Church, or compel him to leave her peaceful fold to roam over wild forests more congenial to his nature, or roar among his kindred spirits. We now propose to notice the attack of this would-be destroyer of the slave-holder. With a roar of assumed holy indignity, he announces his self-presumed heaven-born sentiments by saying that Levi D. Travers, who offered a reward for the apprehension of a runaway slave, is a wealthy local preacher of the M. E. Church, in Dorchester County, Md., and with the same breath he calls him an atheist and man-stealer. And why? Because he claimed property in the person of Aaron Cornish, who had run away. Without any design to enter into an argument on the subject of slavery, I here assert that, in my opinion, my assailant, in thus declaring me to be an atheist and man-stealer, assumes an unwarrantable position, sanctioned neither by the Word of God nor the M. E. Church. The Bible gives instances of the existence of human slavery, but I have never read from the sacred volume a word condemnatory of the institution and practice of slavery.‡

The M. E. Church has ever regarded slavery to be an evil, and while her tendency has been in favor of the emancipation of the slave, and with a view to its attainment, she has strongly favored the African Colonization movement. Whatever may have been the views and feelings of some of her members, she has never in her wisdom presumed to class the slaveholders of the church, or of the nation, among the infidels and thieves. But there seems to be a higher law (in regard to slavery) than the law

* Conservative! Brother conservatists with Bro. Travers they are, doubtless. If they had ever agreed upon a Confession of Faith, and had it written out, we would suspect Bro. Travers of plagiarism in giving his creed on the subject of slavery. We speak of the majority.—AUTHOR.

† That is a truth. See Pastoral Address, in the first part of this pamphlet, if you doubt it, and the *substitute* for Bro. Cunningham's Bill of Exceptions presented by Dr. Hodgson.—AUTHOR.

‡ If the institution and practice of slavery is not condemned in the Word of God, murder is not! What a "school" he must have been in!—AUTHOR.

of God, and the law of the church, and not only is it recognized in the political world, but by one at least of the great body of divinity, John Dixon Long. He has by implication, as an Ecclesiastical Judge of the higher law, passed sentence not only on the M. E. Church, but the M. E. Church South, and the slaveholders of the nation, and branded them with infamy. They are all charged with being atheists and thieves, and according to his opinion the church, as well as the nation, by tolerating the system of slavery, are guilty of a grand larceny.* It is said the receiver is as guilty as the thief; if so, according to the higher law, the church as a body is an infidel church, and stands indicted not only by this prelatial umpire, but by the Judge of all the earth, and is it not a wonder that the Great Head of the church has not poured out the vials of his wrath upon her defenceless head—cursed her ministry, turned the tide of her prosperity, sunk her beneath the ocean of time, and organized a new church, an anti-slavery church,† and called his disciple, John Dixon Long, to the apostleship, and allow him to number his Pictures of Slavery among the Epistles of his first apostles, as the first Epistle of the modern John? Is it not a wonder that the infidel church should have been so successful in bringing souls to Christ? that the Holy of Holies should call her infidels and thieves to be his ambassadors! Yea, even is it not a wonder that he should pardon the infidel slaveholder, when he does not promise to forsake his infidelity and practice of man thefts? As repentance consists in part of the renunciation of all sins, and promise of entire amendment of life, how is it possible for the pardoned sinner to maintain the Christian character, if when he comes in the possession of slaves by inheritance or by purchase, if he does not immediately emancipate them, with or without the consent of the laws of his State? How is it that the slaveholders of the M. E. Church, and the M. C. Church, and all other churches that tolerate the institution of slavery should be in the possession and enjoyment of the religion of the Saviour, which they profess, and through which they have apparent great prosperity and happiness?‡ Is it possible that they are all by common consent wearing the cloak of hypocrisy, and are guilty of such glaring misconception? O that the heavenly wisdom which seems to have been so partially bestowed upon our modern apostle might characterize the infidel church! we should feel terribly alarmed and terror-stricken, if we were not reminded in the good book of false prophets that shall arise, and deceive many; and while doubtless many will be deceived by the monstrous doctrine of this latter day prophet, yet *we* will not be carried about by every kind of doctrine. We are not persuaded that we as an individual, or that the church has unchristianized herself because she tolerates the institution of slavery. We believe that the Lord of hosts is with us, and the God of Jacob is our refuge. We will not fear though the earth be *moved*, and the mountains carried in the midst of seas. Mr. Editor, presuming upon your indulgence, I now propose to speak in my own defence, before that court, which my Ecclesiastical Judge has been pleased to arraign me. In his charge he has been very careful to state that I am a local preacher of the M. E. Church, a truth I would not disguise. I am an humble local preacher of the said church, a position I pray God I may never dishonor. I love the M. E. Church; she is my spiritual mother. She took me in when I was a helpless infant; I have been rocked in her cradle, nurtured in her lap, educated in her school,§ and subscribe to her articles of religion and indorse her discipline, and desire no amendment. I prefer her to all the various branches of Christ's visible church, because I believe her to be the truest resemblance of the Apostolic Church. I will battle upon her fields, fight under her banner while she holds to her Wesleyan discipline. But if she changes her colors,|| I shall throw off all allegiance to her before her fillbustering sons shall

* Have no disposition to quarrel as to the "grand larceny."

† Nineteen-twentieths of the members of our church say she is an anti-slavery church, but Brother Travers, and his slave-holding brethren, have never, for the last generation, had any occasion to think so; we confess. Anti-slavery church! Brother Travers' M. E. Church is a pro-slavery M. E. Church. Understand that: he takes her picture as seen in his own locality, and takes it truly, we confess.

‡ Clear cases in psychology! John Newton, afterward known as Rev. John Newton, the friend and spiritual adviser of Cowper, while the captain of a slaver, could pray and read his Bible in the cabin while hundreds of miserable captives were frantic, smothering, and dying in the hold. And Paul once *served God* by killing good people—that is, he served God, as he thought, and did so by putting Christians to death.

§ School! Yes; and Brother T. has been a proficient in acquiring lessons to quiet his conscience in the holding of men as slaves.

|| Fight under her banner for what? For that *sine qua non* practical indorsement of

spew me out, and join myself to another division of the family of God. I am also charged with claiming property in the person of a negro man named Aaron Cornish, who ran away, and I offered a reward for his apprehension; but in this case I was acting as an administrator,* and in pursuance of a duty enjoined as such, under the laws and usages of Maryland; but I will here remark that I am a slaveholder. I hold twenty slaves (right or wrong), under the sanction of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Maryland. I hold them nearly all by inheritance; one-half as the inheritance of my wife; of the other half, a portion I inherited from my father and son, a part were born of my slaves, and a part purchased, one of which, being the husband of one of my slaves, I bought to prevent his being separated from her for life.

These slaves I have in my own family, and upon my lands, some of them acting as overseers. Now as a slaveholder I cannot conceive that as such I am rebelling against the righteous government of God. I believe that the introduction of slavery upon American soil was either Providential, or that since its introduction Providence has overruled it for good—that the poor heathen Africans by being brought there are to become enlightened, and influenced by the teachings and example of this Christian nation. They will embrace the Christian religion, understand to some extent the plan and working of our government, and are designed, under Providence, gradually to be returned to their native land, and that through them Africa is to become a great Christian nation, and I believe that in order to carry forward this design it is the duty of every slaveholder and every friend of humanity to promote the moral and religious condition of the negro, and of the States as well as individuals to favor the cause of African Colonization. I concede slavery to be an *evil*,† not to the slave but to the master, yet not such an evil (if the master does his duty by providing for their wants, and has a proper regard for their moral and religious training), as will exclude him from the kingdom of heaven, and not an evil making it the duty of the master immediately to emancipate his slaves to loiter about his premises in idleness and rags to plunder his property for a livelihood. Observation has taught us to the contrary.

We insist that it is not our duty as a Christian church and nation, to adopt or favor the policy of the general emancipation of our slaves, because we think that this interest and our duty does not require it.‡ We also think they are an inferior and degenerate race of human beings, and are not entitled, in our own land, to the freedom which we enjoy, purchased by the blood of our forefathers; not entitled to citizenship, and to equal privileges with us (but the right to worship God, and that according to the dictates of their own consciences), but that they should be under our care to be taught habits of industry, taught to obey the laws and fear the golden worship, and others prepared by our precept and example for the appreciation and preservation of a government like ours in the land of their fathers. But while I look upon them as inferior to us I allow that their inferiority did not originate in their creation, but by the force of circumstances, for which we are not responsible. We believe they are the descendants of our great Federal head, and that the redemption of their souls are as precious in the sight of God as that of the white man's. They have never been the objects of my solicitude, and to those of them living in my neighborhood, who make pretensions to piety, I have been one of their private instructors for years. I have endeavored by my admonitions and instructions, to promote their spiritual welfare, by persuading them against the evils that are in the world, and pointing them to the cross and heaven. And now in conclusion, I have a word for you, Mr. Long: You have slandered me, you have slandered the M. E. Church, you have expressed sentiments unauthorized by the church and the word of God, and you are pursuing a course, with regard to slavery, which, while it may fill your pocket with perishable *gold and silver*, will not add to your treasure in heaven; neither will it advance the

slavery? Certainly! If she ceases to do this, "will throw off all allegiance." Ah! we see *what you* are fighting for—not the church, but slaveholding.

* The advertisement did not say, "Levi Travers, Adm'r," but "Levi Travers." We heard that Levi Travers was administrator in this case for one legal heir or more; they were Rev. Levi Travers, his wife, and his children: and the estate was that of a father who had no other heir but which was represented in the person of said Rev. Levi Travers; hence he says, in advertisement, "my negro man."

† "Evil" took legs to leave "Master." "Master" was so in love with it that he offered \$300 reward to get it returned. Valuable "Evil;" twenty more *evils* who from his representation when set free, he would have us believe their names from his description of character, would be spelled with a d before *evils*.

‡ But the Discipline does of Brother Travers.

interest of the slave, and my advice is to you, and the whole abolition faction of the North, to study to be quiet and mind your own business; try and correct the evils that exist among you, in your own respective States, and leave the South to manage her own affairs, to correct her own evils in her own way, as she only is answerable for her sins. She will not be coerced by you; if necessary she will resist unto blood—leave her be, to work out her own salvation according to her own convictions of right or wrong; the Providence of God will with his voluntary co-operation carry forward the great colonization cause, and restore to the bosom of Africa her long lost and forgotten sons, most gloriously improved, whose names will be revered and honored in ages to come as the Fathers of a great Christian republic.

“God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform;
He plants his footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

“Deep in unfathomable minds
Of never failing skill,
He treasures up his bright designs,
And works his sovereign will.”

LEVI D. TRAVERS.

TAYLOR'S ISLAND, Feb. 12th, 1858.

The positions above taken are precisely those of *Dr. Ross*.

I. That slaveholding is not a sin.

II. That slaveholding is nevertheless an evil.

III. That it is only to be continued for the good of the slave.

IV. That those views are conservative.

V. That it would but need Mr. Ross's Calvinism to cover the whole ground of his book—

“*Slavery ordained of God.*”

A FURTHER AND LATEST ILLUSTRATION.

Rev. J. S. Lane driven off from his Circuit by a Slaveholding Board of Stewards, with the concurrence of his Pro-slavery Presiding Elder.

Rev. J. S. Lane, who is supposed to have written the “Junius Letters” from Maryland, which were published in “Zion's Herald,” has recently been “crushed out” by a slave-holding oligarchy, the Board of Stewards of Snow Hill Circuit, Worcester Co., Md., without remonstrance from the Rev. Henry Colclazer, Presiding Elder of Snow Hill District, Philadelphia Conference. Insulted and persecuted, he has been compelled to leave his circuit, to which he had been returned as preacher in charge for the second year by the Bishop at the recent session of our Conference, and is now on his way to free territory. It is but proper to say that many of his people had for him the greatest sympathy, and parted from him with tears. Some of our noble anti-slavery people there—for some are even there—are indignant at his treatment; but the Presiding Elder and the Stewards triumphed, and he has been compelled to leave his work by a miserable clique composed of slave-holders in his Board of Stewards.

The professed occasion of this outrage was not his preaching against slavery, but his acknowledgment of connection with those letters when waited on by an inquisitorial committee of the "simple" slaveholding caste, who demanded an answer to the question "whether he was not the author of the 'Junius Letters?'" Every slaveholding, preacher-driving Steward of them holds official relation to the church in shameless violation of our Discipline.

The whole of this accursed business of oppression of men, whether of slaves or of God's ministers, is disgraceful to the civilization and Christianity of the nineteenth century, and is a dishonor to the memory of Wesley; and the sooner it is driven from our church, the better. These recreant Methodists and their "institution" have well nigh suffocated the whole church with their mutual stench. They ought to be, and we hope soon will be shown the way out of our Zion by the law of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

It is proper that we should state that what we have said as to the sentiment and practice of *the slaveholders* of our church is not intended to intimate, and there has been no purpose on our part to convey the impression that all our members are pro-slavery on that soil. This is far from being true. A majority of our members there are not connected with slavery. Some of them loathe and detest it, and are as strongly anti-slavery in sentiment as was John Wesley himself. Still these are but few, and not usually the persons who control the sentiment of the communities in which they live. Most of these, indeed, are themselves silent altogether, save where they find a congenial spirit with whom to talk over the matter. The rich and the influential members of our church are, in the lower part of our field, found to be slaveholders. Though ineligible to office in Maryland, according to the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they are, nevertheless, placed in office, and wield the greater influence for that reason. It is easy to see, therefore, how our church has become corrupt. The preachers who appoint leaders who are slaveholders to office, and who nominate slaveholders for the office of steward, who license persons as exhorters who are slaveholders and have afterwards given them their influence and recommendation in their getting license to preach; upon those travelling preachers much of the guilt of this matter rests. It is a grave question whether out of all the Quarterly Conferences in the lower part of our work in Maryland, there is a single Quarterly Conference which ought to be recognized by a Presiding Elder as such, for the simple reason that the majority of persons composing them are declared by the law of the Discipline itself to be *ineligible*. If the ineligibility of most of those members be a fact in law, then we would like it shown how a Presiding Elder can recognize them as stewards, leaders, exhorters, and local preachers, and at the same time see, as it is his duty to see, that the Discipline is faithfully carried out upon his District.

The conviction now generally obtains that the church will outlaw slavery throughout our bounds, and is consented to by most as a

fact not far in the future. To this conclusion all minds, whether pro-slavery, conservative, or abolition, have been irresistibly drawn or driven who are capable of beholding the signs of the times. The man who resists the movement with hope of defeating it, but wrestles with destiny and with God. The unfolding of Divine purposes in the successive stages of progress in our church, like the breaking of successive trumpets in the old style of Apocalyptic peals, has conducted the thousands of spectators and actors to the last scene in the drama of our church's history in her struggle to free herself from slavery; a drama which in the Divine records above might well be entitled, "redemption for man as man." Our church may have an Armageddon field which shall witness the collected forces of the misguided, and the "fearful" swelling the ranks of the apologists for wrong; but highest achievements are to be won by those who earnestly battle on the side of freedom. Under the same conqueror, too, seen in that dread yet glorious old vision, shall the struggle be won! for he whose Godhead's Name is "written on his thigh," is he who was "sent to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the doors to them who are bound."

A difference of opinion obtains as to the way in which the church is to free herself of this evil by her further legislation.

There are those, and they are the vast majority of the two classes of laborers for slavery extirpation from the church, who believe that the direct action of the General Conference is all that is necessary in order to effect the desired legislation. The other thinks there are constitutional objections to this mode of action. We regret this, and hope that the representatives of both sides will be in earnest as to having the work done in 1860.

Let us be understood! Those whose theory of the constitution of the church is such as to find in that instrument a bar to proceeding in any other way than by the restrictive rule process in order to the extirpation of slaveholding from the church, and who profess to be anti-slavery in faith and feeling equally with those who prefer the more direct way of detaching this great evil from us, must show as the highest test of the sincerity of their moral conviction, a direct and zealous antagonism to the evil of slavery. Let there be no stopping of the sentiment of the onward church by interposing the supposed or real constitutional impediment. Let there be no sneers at any movement seeking the increase of strength for the anti-slavery sentiments of the church. Let it be merely a difference of opinion as to the best method of doing the desired work of extirpation. If this be done, then there will appear from these, representing as they manifestly do those sections of the church where the anti-slavery sentiment is weakest, in outspoken declaration and unquestionable activity a zealous adherence to the great principle at stake in all these issues. But if it be shown that the constitutionalists use their doctrine as a rampart where pro-slaveryism takes shelter, behind whose walls of circumvallation slaveholding, slavebreeding, and

slavery perpetuating apostates from true Methodism find convenient warehousing and patronage in their business; if such as these are the known allies who supply the magazine, if they do not direct the guns by which the anti-slavery convictions of our people are sought to be killed off, then those ramparts will be stormed, and though "constitutionalists" may seek to be successful in clutching the treasures which should be a common heritage, nor pains, nor losses, nor any consideration of worldly expediency will, we believe, prevent one great heroic attempt in 1860 to wipe out the church's dishonor.

In the publication you have perused, dear reader, we have but conducted you with the tenderest conveyance along the shore, sparing your sensibilities whenever we properly could, pointing out merely the greenest headlands, and the brightest promontories jutting out in our sight. The vast continent of vice lying back of these is unexplored. If you have seen monstrous wrongs like anacondas in whose folds struggled your brothers and sisters, and in vain; and fearful oppressions like tigers drinking the blood of its resisting or unresisting victims, yet let us assure you in the deep jungles of its vast interior are shapes and sounds of misery and formidable wrongs such as imagination itself may not exaggerate. Into that vast continent, and cognizant of its cruelties, and the sorrows inflicted upon His children, looks the blazing and omniscient Eye. As Methodists, you are asked, Will you seek "to deliver those who are appointed to die" in slavery? or, if this be beyond the reach of the church, you are asked, Shall the monstrous oppression be a sanctified thing, protected by church policy, tolerated at your altars, and batten on your fatness; or will you withdraw from it your sympathies and give them to the crushed and down-trodden slave?

Finally, let us remember that though it were shown that in our church the slave was generally treated well, still the terrible *fact* remains. Still *the tears and blood of the enslaved are daily dropping on our altars*. Throw over it what veil of extenuation and excuse you may, the essential crime and shame remain. Believe as kindly as you can of the treatment which the slaves receive of humane and Christian masters, it is only on condition that they first surrender their every *right* as men. Let them dare demur to that, and their tears and blood must answer it.



